

THE  
REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

---

NO. 2.—APRIL, 1899.

---

I.

THE QUAKER AND PALATINE AS COMMONWEALTH  
BUILDERS.

BY FRANK RIED DIFFENDERFFER.

It is always interesting and profitable to trace the rise and progress of any community or people. It becomes doubly so when such investigations relate largely to ourselves or those related to us by political ties and the still nearer bonds of actual kinship. In this latter case, however, we are prone to allow our education and training to bias our views, and our judgments may not then be of that impartial character which ought always to mark such a discussion. I hold, however, that we may entertain partisan views without doing injustice, may feel strongly and yet be capable of rendering unto Cæsar the things that belong to Cæsar.

Without disguise or equivocation, I avow myself a Pennsylvanian of Pennsylvanians. My affection for my native State is hardly second to my love of my ancestry. I take pride in her glorious origin. I rejoice in her matchless prosperity. Her wonderful resources excite my admiration. Her exalted place in the Sisterhood of States rouses my patriotism in a fuller measure. But above all, do I glory in the people who have made her such—in the Quaker and Palatine, men, speaking different tongues, coming here from different countries, whose habits and customs

were unlike, and who yet had points of resemblance—for these people, these commonwealth builders, I have an admiration which nothing can change and an affection second only to that for home and family.

But it is because my native State and the people who made her great have not been accorded that credit and honor which is most strictly their due, that this article has been written. I believe that Pennsylvania is to-day the grandest Commonwealth in all the Sisterhood of the States. She may not have the wealth of her neighbor on the north, or equal her in population, but I question whether in all other respects she does not lead her as well as all the rest. In her mineral and agricultural resources, in educational matters, in her unequalled progress, and above all, in the character of her citizens, their industry, energy, enterprise and thrift, I believe she stands peerless.

It shall be my task to state briefly what I believe are the true reasons of her proud preëminence, and in so doing pay that tribute to those who achieved this grand work, which their deeds and principles deserve. It is only in recent years that the share our State has taken in the building of this nation appears to have been fully realized. The Carthaginians were wont to say they made history, but that the Romans wrote it. That is our case. For two hundred years we Pennsylvanians have been making history, and good history too. While we have gone forward steadily in our work of Commonwealth building, we have unwisely allowed other men to tell what we have done. The result has been what we might have looked for. They have given to the world what was best and brightest in their own annals, and left us with a friendly nod at best, in the background, where they found us. I do not altogether agree with the first Napoleon, that history is a fable agreed upon. But a reading of many of our histories, in which all the honors and glory have gone to the north and south of us, while we have been left to keep alive our records and memories as best we could, neither dissenting nor protesting as the written pages went out to the world, seems to show that the Great Captain's theory is not altogether obsolete, even in our own

time. I believe a better day for us is not only coming, but that it is even now at hand. Many a ringing protest has gone out in these latter days. Book upon book has come from the press that has shed a flood of light upon this subject, and many more will follow them until the truth will stand revealed before all men; when the bearers of false witness shall be unmasked, when the glamour which has so long blinded men will be swept away, and the world see us as we have been in the past and as we are to-day.

I do not propose to assail any people who sought homes and founded States in this New World. Infinite credit is due them all in many particulars. But I purpose to tell why our State is the grandest among all the forty-five. To do this, I shall compare and contrast the men who came here with the men who went elsewhere. To tell what the Quaker and the Palatine did, and what was done by the Puritans and the Cavaliers. If in so doing I am led into remarks that seem unkind, it must be remembered that I am only stating facts, and the blame must be affixed where it belongs, not to me. To attempt to set before the intelligent reader some of the characteristics of the races that shared in the rearing of this Commonwealth, and to show that in none of the attributes that go to make up the true citizen and patriot, were they inferior to any race or nationality, is the task to which I address myself. If I fail in so doing, even then I beg leave to say that the fault is not theirs, but wholly mine.

I believe modern writers, and, perhaps, I ought to especially include the professional historians, lay too much stress on religious motives, religious persecutions, the repression of free thought and kindred questions as inducing causes to emigration. I do not dispute their influence as important factors in this mighty problem. I will go still further and concede that in occasional instances they may have been the chief motives, but such cases I believe are rare. As I read history, there are other and more potent causes that have, separately or combined, brought about the desire to migrate, to seek new homes in new lands. Emigration rarely turns to an old country, one full of people and where

the struggle for existence is as severe as in that from which it comes. On the contrary, its steps are directed "to fresh woods and pastures new," and there is purpose as well as method in such a course. It is the desire to better their worldly condition, the hope of material advancement, in short, it is better bread and more of it that lies at the source of nearly all the migrations of the human family. It is that which to-day sends the Italian multitudes to these United States, to Argentina and Brazil; that brought the Slav to the coal mines of Pennsylvania and sent a million descendants of the Norsemen into our great northwest. None of these fled from religious persecutions. They all had toleration at home. We can apply the same safe rule to the early colonization of this country. It will hold good in New England, just as it does in Pennsylvania and the States lying south of her. When, therefore, I am asked to believe the Puritans came over solely to escape persecution and in search of "a faith's pure shrine," I decline the invitation. I do not subscribe to that theory, even though it has done duty for two centuries and a-half unquestioned. I challenge it on general principles. I refuse to agree to the proposition as it has been laid down for my acceptance, because I believe the men and women who came over in the *Mayflower*, were in the main like the other people who sought these shores, and I do not think there is a single reader who does not know, or believe, that the purpose of the French in Canada, of the Dutch in New York, of the Swedes on the Delaware, of the Quakers and Palatines in Pennsylvania, of the English Cavaliers between Maryland and the Savanna or the Spaniards in Florida, was, in the main, and in most instances exclusively for gain, for bettering their condition, and that other motives were secondary, and perhaps in most cases, absent altogether.

I need not enter into an elaborate argument to show that the commercial feature was uppermost in the settlement of all the Colonies and Provinces south of the Hudson. Every line of their history bears out this view. Sentimental ideas did not sway the matter-of-fact people of Holland. Penn mingled a good deal of sincere piety with his colonization scheme, but the feature of gain

was ever kept in sight. Lord Baltimore in a letter to the Earl Strafford, has recorded as clearly as language can, that his purpose was to promote his worldly interests.<sup>1</sup> In every line of the history of Virginia, the Carolinas and Georgia, the same evidence is at the front and no other reason is alleged.

What is the evidence from the Eastern Colonies? We are told it was not the "jewels of the mine" they sought. I agree with that, for there were none there. But I disagree when the historians strike hands with the poetess in declaring they cared not for "the wealth of seas or the spoils of war." Why their ships were on the sea after the whales and the cod as soon as they were able to build them; and as for the spoils of war, the lands and corn and furs wrested from the Indians, attest how ardently that line of pursuit was followed. Contradict it who may, the fact will nevertheless remain that the love of gain, the desire for property, and the accumulation of wealth, inspired the Puritans in their migration from the Old World as much as it did the Vikings who swept over the shores of Britain, Gaul, Spain and along the Mediterranean, eight hundred years before. It was the great underlying principle that led to the colonization of the American continent, and we stultify ourselves when we allow a mawkish sentimentality to swerve our minds from the truth.

But I turn now to the people to whom our State, as I am fully persuaded, owes her greatness. Into the warp and woof of our political and social fabric have been harmoniously woven the personalities of many nations. From the forests and fiords of Sweden came the bold and hardy descendants of her ancient sea kings. From behind the dikes of Holland came the thrifty merchant and sailor. From the cities and towns of England came the Quaker on his mission of civilization. Close upon his heels came the sons of the Fatherland. From the castellated Rhine, the mountains of Switzerland and the recesses of Bohemia and Moravia, they flocked to the land of promise. From the blue hills of Wales

<sup>1</sup> Light Thrown by the Jesuits upon Hitherto Obscure Points of Early Maryland History. By Rev. Edward D. Neill. See the Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography. Vol. 5, p. 55.

came the white-winged ships with the expecting emigrants. Ireland and Caledonia sent their sons, while the vine-clad hills of sunny France swelled the inflowing tide of nation builders. Norseman and Saxon, Teuton and Celt, men of all nationalities and every creed, here met upon terms of equality, under the most favorable conditions ever vouchsafed by heaven to man. Here their wisdom built up a fabric of government unequalled for its beauty, its symmetry and moderation, by any seen of mortals since the patriarchs of old fed their flocks upon Judean hills.

But let us inquire a little more closely into the characteristics of these men of many races. Nearly half a century before Penn acquired his province, a colony of Swedish peasants, honest, simple hearted, God fearing and true, had been planted upon the Delaware. They bought—not stole—their lands from the Indians, the rightful owners. They built their homes and lived lives of honorable toil. They were worthy forerunners of the men who came after them and with whom their political destinies were soon to be merged. All honor to these pious sons of a heroic ancestry who blazed the way for the later civilization that was to follow.

I need say nothing of the Quaker to intelligent readers. He is still in evidence to-day, and is able to take care of himself now, as he was two hundred years ago. But there was a failure of succession. In time there was no further infusion from outside sources, and even the Friend has lost the grip he once had on the situation. But yet I will say that nowhere between the St. Lawrence and the Isthmus, did a grander figure set foot upon the soil of the New World. Contrast him with the Puritan? The latter shrinks in the comparison. Measure him with the Cavalier, and he towers a giant.

From the greenest of British Isles came a composite people, with all the virtues and peculiarities of two races—the Scotch-Irish. That sturdy independent race, driven by the intolerable exactions of large-landed proprietors from their homes, were no mean addition to the nation builders Penn drew about him in the wilds of Pennsylvania.

The men of fiery Cymric blood, the Welsh, left their mountain fastnesses, where of old they long held at bay the conquerors of Britain, and came to swell the triumph of the founder. No men that crossed the broad Atlantic, were more conservative, more devoted to their rights and opinions. Firm even to obstinacy in their views; proud of their lineage and language, they were men who, knowing their rights, dared maintain them. Many of them left home and kindred for opinions' sake as truly as any Pilgrim that stepped ashore on Plymouth rock.

The Huguenot came too, though in smaller numbers. His ancestors had passed through the fires of persecution and oppression, but he held through it all to his ancestral faith and sought to recover in his new home what he had lost in the old.

But there was still another people who flocked to the Land of Promise. Among the first to give ear to the persuasive voice of the Proprietary, they came early and they came late and they kept coming, and are coming still, until they have outnumbered all the rest. They were the men of German blood, the dwellers along the Rhine; the sons of the Palatinate, where the glow of sunset for many years was eclipsed by the blazing homes of the peasantry. If ever there was a land and a period of trial and persecution, turn to the Palatinate; you will find them there. Inured to toil in field and factory, they brought their industry and their thrift with them, and to them more than to all others, do we owe it that the forest monarchs were laid low and the valleys of Pennsylvania, from the Delaware to the Ohio, year by year ripen their harvests, until one almost imagines that the earlier Eden has come back to man.

"This Province," said one of our Provincial Governors, "has been for some years the asylum of the distressed Protestants from the Palatinate and other parts of Germany, and I believe it may with truth be said that the present flourishing condition of it is, in a great measure owing to the industry of those people; and should any discouragement divert them from coming hither, it may well be apprehended that the value of your lands will fall, and your advances to wealth be much slower; for it is not alto-

gether the goodness of the soil, but the number and industry of the people, that make a flourishing country."<sup>2</sup>

The past one hundred years have wrought wonderful changes in the land of Penn. The Swede is recalled only by his name and the few honorable descendants still among us. As a political factor he may be said to no longer exist. The Welshman, who once proposed to perpetuate his race, his laws and his language in the heart of the new Province, has been lost sight of in later years. The "Welsh Barony" exists only on the old maps. Its people have been swallowed up. He, too, only survives in name. The Huguenot is extinct. His very names have suffered a change, and we know him no longer. The Scotch-Irishman is still here, and numerously, and wherever found bears the racial traits that marked his earliest appearance. Like the Swede and the Welshman and the Huguenot, his numbers have not been augmented by fresh blood, and his influence to-day is only felt as it is found in combination with that of other peoples. Not so, however, with the Quaker's religious kinsman, the German. The impulse given to his province by the liberality of the Proprietary and his own countrymen has survived the mutations of time and is to-day part and parcel of the public and private life of the Commonwealth. One hundred years after Pastorius planted his little colony at Germantown, the Germans outnumbered by far the men of any other nationality, and composed more than one-half of the entire population.<sup>3</sup>

I have been unable to ascertain with any reasonable degree of certainty the number of Welsh and Scotch-Irish that came here.

<sup>2</sup> Address of Governor Thomas to the Provincial Assembly in 1738.

<sup>3</sup> A recent writer has depicted humorously but truthfully, this phase of the situation. He said: "Penn attempted to engraft on his English stock other scions, trusting to the virility of his masterful race to preserve the English type, but the strong German sap has outworn them all. The descendants of the early English who own acres of land here to-day are becoming rare. The children of the Scotch-Irish by a kind of natural selection have quit farming and taken to politics and business, and their ancient acres are covered with the big red barns that betoken another kindred. The Welshman has been lost in the shuffle, and the Quaker is marrying the Dutch girl in self defense. So reads the record at the close of the nineteenth century."—E. K. Martin, Esq.

Fortunately for them, and unfortunately for us, no head tax was laid upon them at their coming, and the records bear little testimony to their numbers. But the honored names of Lloyd, Cadwalader, Wayne, Owen and many more, still among us, bear testimony to the stamina and virility of their sturdy race.

Between the Welsh who stood out for autonomy, so to speak, on their 40,000 acre tract, the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians with their semi-Puritan aggressiveness, and the Quakers, there was never true cordiality nor affiliation. If the Quaker was a man of peace, the Scotch-Irishman was as truly a man of war. There could be only a slight bond of mutual interest. But how stood the account between the Quaker and the Palatine? Twelve hundred years before Penn became the owner of Pennsylvania, the Saxon left his home in Northern Germany on his mission of civilization and conquest in the west. He visited Britain and engrafted laws and speech and racial characteristics upon that country and people. In time these ties were sundered politically, but Teutonic vigor remained; it had become a part of the nation which no after changes were able to efface.

The Reformation served in a measure to revive those ancient bonds. Northern Germany was largely Protestant and so was England, made so by the obstinate Henry. But there were dissensions in the Established Church. Non-conformists, Quakers and others came upon the field. So, too, it was in Germany, and especially throughout the Palatinate. There the Mennonite became a living force in the religious world. Such was the situation in 1677, when Penn, Fox and Barclay, the embodiment of the Quaker faith, sailed for Germany on a mission of religious conquest. What a trio of noble names! Saw the world ever a greater in the domain of conscience and civil liberty? They were everywhere welcomed by the Mennonites, between whom and themselves were found many religious traits that made them gravitate towards each other. Barclay expressly says "that so closely do these views"—those of the Mennonites—"correspond with those of George Fox, that we are compelled to view him as the unconscious exponent of the doctrines, practices and discipline

of the ancient and stricter party of the Dutch Mennonites."<sup>4</sup> Dr. Seidensticker said, "both laid the greatest stress on inward piety, and a godly humble life; considered strife and warfare as unchristian; scrupulously abstained from making oath; declared against a paid ministry; exercised through their meetings a strict discipline over their members; favored silent prayer; were opposed to infant baptism, and looked upon the established churches as unhallowed vessels of the divine truth."<sup>5</sup> What was more natural than that William Penn should revert to the hearing and hospitality these people had accorded him, when he became the owner of this goodly heritage in the West? What more natural that knowing their thrift, their honesty and unobtrusive piety, he should invite them to come to his colony and partake of the fullness thereof.

And they came. The good ship "Concord" carried them over. Never did vessel, not even the "Mayflower" or "Harvest Moon" bring a richer freightage to these shores than the ship that cast its anchor in the Delaware on that autumnal day in 1683. I could quote a volume to show the near relations and religious affinity of the Quakers and the Palatinates when they met on this ever memorable spot. It would be idle, for the story is known to all.

The Saxon and the Anglo-Saxon once more met. This time not in the roar of battle, axe and spear in hand, to despoil and destroy, but drawn together by the bond of a common faith and a common purpose. Meeting thus, what was it but a family reunion, so to speak? Centuries before the foundations of civil liberty had been laid deep and strong on the British strand, and once again the old faith and the old freedom were proclaimed as they never had been before, and here, in this western land, freedom of speech and conscience was offered to all of the wide scattered lineage of Adam.

<sup>4</sup> Barclay's *Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth*, p. 77.

<sup>5</sup> William Penn's *Travels in Holland and Germany*. *The Penna. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, p. 243.

In the new bond that here united the English Quaker and his full cousin, the Palatine Mennonite, was realized that ideal union of races, with all its accompanying benefits and characteristics, that have given our Commonwealth her truly great and well-merited renown. That ideal union so fruitful of supreme results. Something like this must have been in the Laureate's mind when he wrote :

"Oh rest thee sure  
That I shall love thee and cleave to thee,  
So that my vigor, wedded to thy blood,  
Shall strike within thy pulses like a God's,  
To push thee forward through a life of shocks,  
Dangers and deeds, until endurance grow  
Sinewed with action, and the full-grown will,  
Circled through all experiences, pure law,  
Commeasure perfect freedom."<sup>6</sup>

What a contrast to the lands whence these new-found relatives came ? There priestcraft, tyranny, oppression and caste. Here, upon this modern Patmos, the evangel of liberty, civil and religious, rose upon every breeze and filled every ear with its melody.

But let us look a little more closely into the racial traits of this truly cosmopolitan province, which, through every decade of its history retained her fidelity to liberal ideas and original character. The wonder is that it did not remain or become a land of many nationalities and peoples, like Austria, each jealous of its own language and customs and determined to adhere to them. Passionately attached to the land of their birth, they nevertheless, in the hour of supreme trial, with few exceptions, gave unswerving loyalty to the dearer land of their adoption. The religious element was strongly developed in them all. It was one of the foundation stones of the Christian commonwealth founded by Penn. There were many poor men and a few rich ones, but this created no animosities, and each one was content to work out his own destiny in peace and without envy. With them the banner of freedom was not misnamed and it was flung to the welcoming winds unstained by blood and undimmed by wrong. One of our first historians has well said these people need not be

<sup>6</sup> Lord Tennyson, *Oenone*.

"wrapped up in fine spun cloaks of excuses and apology, with stilts, buskins, tinsel and bedizziment, but in their own proper persons, often rude, hard, narrow, superstitious and mistaken, but always earnest, downright, manly and sincere. The result of their labors is eulogy enough ; their best apology is to tell their story exactly as it was."<sup>7</sup> While these words were not especially directed at the Germans, they apply as well to them as to the others. These are the domestic heroes to whom I would pay respectful and grateful homage here, and while the spirit of genuine freedom dwells within the human breast, "while rivers run into the sea, while shadows move around the convex mountains, while heaven feeds the stars,"<sup>8</sup> their name and fame will live in the annals of time.

But we must not lose sight of the great man, the great first cause, the mighty factor to whom this grand result of the centuries is so largely due—the man William Penn himself. I do not pretend to cast about him that saintly aureole which the historians have hung over every one of Mayflower descent. He was a man, and therefore human. He has been assailed by the defamer, but his fame is all the brighter for the attack ; it was never so secure as it is to-day. I will make no attempt to pronounce a eulogy upon him. It has often been done, but never better than in an address delivered on the occasion of the bi-centennial anniversary of the landing of William Penn. So grand, so eloquent, so true was this picture, that I cannot forbear to present it again for the reader's enjoyment ; " His preparation for his crowning work had been ample and peculiar. He had met Locke at Oxford, and had studied law at Lincoln's Inn ; he had read with attention Lord Coke and Magna Charta, and made each word of gold his own ; he had kindled at the protest of the Barons of Runnymede, and breathed a similar spirit of defiance ; he had scanned the whole fabric of social freedom, and, pen in hand, had traced to their fountains the liberties of Englishmen ; he had felt

<sup>7</sup> Hildreth's Hist. of the United States, Vol. 1, p. 3.

<sup>8</sup> In freta dum fluvii current, dum montibus umbræ, lustrabunt convexeæ, polus dum sidera pascet, etc. Virgil, *Aeneid*.

the fierce grasp of arbitrary power and suffered the horrors of the dock and the gaol. \* \* \* He had divined the truth that about the person and the mind of man there is something too sacred for even the anointed fingers of a king to touch ; his ears had been pierced by the wail of those persecuted for ‘conscience sake ;’ he had seen the flames curl about Elizabeth Gaunt and had gazed on the mutilated limbs of Cornesh at Cheapside ; he had debated the loftiest propositions of government with Sidney ; he had talked with Milton of Pym and Hampden, and dreamed with Moore and Harrington of the ideal state. \* \* \* His mind was a battle ground ; the superstition of the past and the iron tyranny of the present met the hopes of the future, and convulsed his soul by the shock of arms. The result was a paradox. A friend of the people, he was the favorite of kings, a man of peace, yet the apostle of progress, an advocate of toleration, yet the champion of aggressive reform, an angel of mercy, yet a bolt of destruction, the herald of the things to be, the executioner of the things that are. \* \* \* He severed church from state, guarded the rights of conscience, wedded religious liberty to civil security, encouraged immigration, armed the citizen with the ballot, provided for the freedom and purity of elections, forbade taxation without representation, threw open the courts, simplified pleadings and processes, gave the right to counsel in cases of felony, declared the right to trial by jury ; converted prisons into workhouses, abolished the infamy of gaoler’s fees, subjected lands to the payment of debts, punished bribery and extortion, discouraged frauds by the registry of deeds and wills, destroyed multiplicity of suits, overturned the inequalities of primogeniture, suppressed piracy, assailed vice, stripped the criminal law of atrocious punishments, established schools, encouraged literature, rewarded science, and thus strove to secure the peace, purity and happiness of his people.”<sup>9</sup>

But words of eulogy, be they never so eloquent, seem tame and trite beside the true grandeur of the man as we learn to know him from his written words and his still grander deeds.

<sup>9</sup> Hampton L. Carson, Esq., Address at the Bi-centennial Anniversary of the Landing of William Penn.

In Pennsylvania this great apostle of the rights of man, this High Priest of civil liberty, planted a principle that will outlive the stars and outburn the auroral fires of the north. He was as successful as he was practical. All men believed in his sincerity and honesty. Other reformers died in jail or perished on the scaffold. It was his privilege to live to witness with his own eyes the success of much that he planned. Toleration, liberty, justice : that was the platform on which he founded his Province. Have modern lawgivers given us anything better? Have they given us anything as good? Is it any wonder that in three years after its settlement Philadelphia had gained more than New York in half a century? Well could he exclaim, with true modesty, but with honest exultation, "I must without vanity, say, I have led the greatest colony into America that ever any man did upon a private credit, and the most prosperous beginnings that ever were in it, are to be found among us."<sup>10</sup> I believe it will be the verdict of all coming time that William Penn was the purest, the wisest, the most benevolent man that ever set foot on this Western world from the days of Red Eric until the present hour.

I will be pardoned if I direct attention to some points of difference between Pennsylvania and some of the colonies to the north and south of her. The establishment of religious liberty threw open public office to all who believed in the Saviour of men. The interests of the people were ever paramount to those of the Proprietor. He was always ready and willing to concede what they requested. More than once the stress of circumstances almost led to a surrender of the Province to the Crown, but on every occasion he stipulated for the liberties he had granted to the people, and which he would not barter away under any circumstances. It was a government of all the people, for the people, in the broadest meaning of the term.

How different was the conduct of the men who planted their feet in Massachusetts! The vindictive bigotry which had sent so many Puritans into exile in Queen Mary's reign, was quickly manifested by the Puritans on the shores of Massachusetts.

<sup>10</sup> Penn to Halifax, in Watson, p. 19.

Forgetting what they had undergone at home and coming direct from their quiet asylum in Holland, intolerance marked almost every step in their career, as well towards those of their own blood as towards the aborigines, whose lands were in most cases stolen and whose persons were enslaved. They visited with incredible hatred and vindictiveness the men who differed with them in matters of creed, albeit their equals in intelligence and sincerity. The Quakers were pronounced "fit instruments to propagate the Kingdom of Satan." They sought "not the death, but the absence of Quakers" and killed and deported them to bring about that desired result. Even to bring one of this sect into the colony was punishable with a fine of one hundred pounds, besides bonds to carry him back again, or in default thereof, imprisonment. The Quaker himself was to be whipped twenty stripes, sent to the house of correction and kept at hard labor until transported. Even the possession of Quaker books was strictly prohibited; all such books were to be brought to the nearest magistrate and burned. Defending Quaker opinions was punishable with fine, and on the third offense, with the house of correction and banishment. That was in 1656. A year later the previous fines were increased; every hour's entertainment of a Quaker involved a fine of forty shillings; every male Quaker, besides former penalties, was to lose one ear on his first conviction and on the second the other, and both males and females, on third conviction, were to have their tongues bored through with red-hot iron. But even that did not suffice to keep these gentle people out of Massachusetts. But these Mayflower people, these Pilgrims, whose Christian virtues historians have held up for our admiration, if not for imitation, were equal to the emergency, and in 1659, a law for the capital punishment of returned Quakers was enacted, and Marmaduke Stevenson and William Robinson were quickly swung from the scaffold by the men who landed at Plymouth in search of "a faith's pure shrine." Mary Dyer, who was condemned with them, was reprieved on the scaffold, but suffered in the same way a few months later, as also did William Leddie.

Many others were exiled as "unfit for the society" of these most excellent Puritans. Even Rhode Island, where one would think the tolerant spirit of Roger Williams had permeated the public conscience, denied the right of religious liberty to Roman Catholics by her oldest code of laws.

But there was a little conscience left even in Boston. We recall the circumstance told by Whittier, how, when the haughty Endicott asked the ship-captains to bear a Quaker maiden to the Indies and slavery, a heroic-souled skipper answered from his fearless heart,

Pile my ship with bars of silver ; pack with coin of Spanish gold,  
From keel-piece up to deck plank, the roomage of her hold :  
By the living God who made me, I would sooner in your bay,  
Sink ship, and crew, and cargo, than bear this child away.<sup>11</sup>

How was it in this respect with the civilization that grew up in the south ? There the projectors were men of different mould. The Carolinas were not erected as governments of the people, by the people and for the people. In thought, in habit, in design and in interest, the projectors offered the strongest possible contrast to the men of New England. Puritan and Cavalier ! Are there two other words in our language that convey such opposite meanings ? There Lord Shaftsbury, Sir William Berkeley, the Duke of Albemarle, Lord Craven, Lord Clarendon, Sir John Colleton and Sir George Carteret were the proprietors and founders. They belonged to the wealthy nobility. With their grant went almost absolute authority. Eight men were to be the sovereigns, never more, never less. The interests of the proprietors, "a government most agreeable to monarchy," and the dread of "a numerous democracy"<sup>12</sup> were the inspiring principles. It was a landed aristocracy, and under their charter they enjoyed almost feudal privileges.

Leet-men, or tenants renting a few acres on large estates, possessed no political franchises, and what was still worse, the law prescribed that "all the children of leet-men shall be leet-men,

<sup>11</sup> Ballad of Cassandra of Southwick.

<sup>12</sup> Bancroft's History of the United States, Vol. 2, p. 147.

and so to all generations."<sup>13</sup> All legislative, executive and judicial power was taken out of the hands of the people, and lodged in those of the proprietors. They could erect cities and manors, counties and baronies and establish orders of nobility. In addition they could make war on sea and land and proclaim martial law. Religious intolerance began to prevail as it did in New England, against Quakers, Baptists and all Non-conformists. Huguenots, Dutch, Germans, Irishmen and others went there, but made little impression. They could not rise to a true conception of the needs of time, and that fact effectually barred their progress. Their exclusiveness, their illiberality and their self-sufficiency held them aloof from other peoples, and they have lagged in the great race of progress to this very hour. The material for the building of a great and prosperous commonwealth was not there, not in the founders, and still less in the men who went or were sent there as colonists. Liberty and toleration such as existed in the land of Penn were unknown. It was only long years after, when rulers learned more of the rights of men, that a better day came along. But, meanwhile, they were passed in the great march of progress. And yet these men begged the land from the sovereign under the hypocritical pretext of "a pious zeal for the propagation of the Gospel."<sup>14</sup> Is it any wonder no church was erected for forty years after the settlement of North Carolina?

There were several other points of difference between Pennsylvania and the colonies north and south of her, to which I may be allowed briefly to advert. One of these is the policy pursued towards the Red Men. Almost the first measure of importance set on foot by Penn was to extinguish the rights of the aborigines to the soil, by fair and honorable purchase, and to form treaties of amity with them. Three such purchases had been made up to June 25, 1683. By October, 1686, nine several purchases had been made. I have not gone beyond that period, but treaties and new purchases were made every few years during

<sup>13</sup> Bancroft's Hist., Vol. 2, p. 148.

<sup>14</sup> Bancroft's Hist., Vol. 2, p. 130.

the next half century. Only once did Pennsylvania deal dishonorably with the Indians; it was during the "go as you please walk" in Bucks County in 1737, nineteen years after the Founder's death, and all men know such sharp practice would never have received his sanction. The result of all this was that we had no Indian wars, save such as were forced upon us by the quarrels of the mother country with France. "Not a drop of Quaker blood was ever shed by an Indian."<sup>15</sup> Even in the courts of justice Indians had the same rights as the whites themselves and, what is more, when an Indian was to be tried half the jury was to be of his own race.<sup>16</sup> The world has never seen a nobler example of even-handed justice.

But how stood the case in New England and in the South? The Puritans were continually at war with the Red Men. Their history shows an almost unbroken stream of Indian blood. It was war, first, last and all the time, and such war! The first hostilities were provoked by the whites, and thenceforth they were almost continuous until the last Indian life went out in blood. They were treacherously entrapped and slain without mercy. No one was allowed to speak or parley with an Indian, and the officials were to fall on all found around the plantations.<sup>17</sup> At one fell blow 600 Pequods were killed, and the 200 that survived were carried into slavery in 1637; even the orphaned children of brave King Philip shared the latter fate. That great New

<sup>15</sup> Bancroft, Vol. 2, p. 383.

<sup>16</sup> In the "Certain Conditions or Concessions" which Penn framed and exacted from colonists and purchasers of his lands, on July 11, 1681, we find the following provisions:

"That no man shall by any ways or means, in word or deed, affront or wrong an Indian, but he shall incur the same penalty of the Law, as if he had committed it against his fellow planters."

"That all differences between the planters and the natives shall also be ended by twelve men, that is, by six planters and six natives, that so we may live friendly together, etc."

"That the Indians shall have liberty to do all things relating to improvement of their ground, and providing sustenance for their families, that any of the planters shall enjoy."

Colonial Records, First Series, Vol. 1, p. 27.

<sup>17</sup> Hildreth, Vol. 1, pp. 125-134.

England celebrity, the favorite child of Mayflower memory, Governor Winthrop, bequeathed Indian slaves in his will. Can we even imagine such a thing of him who founded this goodly colony on the banks of the Delaware?

What was the situation to the south of us? It was built along the same lines and carried out in the same way. Indian troubles broke out from the beginning in Virginia. The whites pressed into the interior and as early as 1623-4 exterminating raids on the Red Men were begun. In 1630 a law was passed that no peace should be made with them. This was repeated in 1644 and it was customary to distress them by sudden raids, and when six chieftains presented themselves to treat for peace they were ruthlessly butchered. For one hundred years Virginia kidnapped negroes for slaves.<sup>18</sup> The famous Bacon's rebellion arose out of private warfare again the Indians. While the Puritan and Cavalier were wasting their energies and resources in needless warfare, the Quaker and the Palatine enriched themselves by their honest Indian trade. So satisfactory was our advancement under such regulations that in time even Virginia and Maryland came to see things in a truer light, and they begged to unite with us in making treaties with the natives. It was one of the wisest things they did, and it was honest, trustworthy John Conrad Weiser, a true son of the Palatinate, who lent his assistance to get them out of the troubles that had retarded their progress for more than a hundred years.

I may be permitted to turn to one more striking illustration to show the difference between the men who made Pennsylvania and those who filled the cabin of the Mayflower. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were fruitful in superstitions. All classes of men were more or less affected or swayed by them. This was the case in Penn's colony, as it was in the region north of Long Island Sound. But how different was the action of those people and our own. There the popular faith in witchcraft was gratified by the execution of Anne Hibbins and a score of others, while Cotton Mather kept the public frenzy at the highest point of excite-

<sup>18</sup> Bancroft, Vol. 1, p. 169.

ment by his violent screeds. Here there were also believers in witchcraft. One turbulent woman, Margaret Matson was brought to trial. Penn himself presided at that trial. The witnesses were heard, and the Proprietor charged the jury. The verdict was, "The prisoner is guilty of the common fame of being a witch, but not guilty as she stands indicted."<sup>19</sup> That was the first and last trial for witchcraft in Pennsylvania. It settled the legal status of the question forever here.

The charge has again and again been brought that the Quakers had little education and the Palatines still less. I admit the educational test is a fair one, and on it alone I would be willing to rest my case. How do we meet this accusation? I appeal to the record. Three years after Penn's coming, in 1685, William Bradford established his printing press in Philadelphia, and in 1699 Reynier Jansen did the same thing. The first newspaper was established in 1719, thirty-seven years after the founding of Penn's province. The first one established in New England was in 1704, eighty-four years after the landing of the Puritans.<sup>20</sup> Long before any other colony had thought of establishing a subscription library, Dr. Franklin had laid the foundation of one in Philadelphia. It was in 1732, and its founder with laudable pride called it "the mother of all the North American subscription libraries." A second one came along in 1755, at Hatboro' near Philadelphia, and the third in the city of Lancaster in 1759. The Loganian library was established in 1745, but it was not founded by public contributions. The first library among the Cavaliers came along in 1748, at Charleston S. C. The first one established by the Puritans was at Newport, R. I., in 1747. The honors are fairly with the Quaker and Palatine in this particular. But how was it with the publication of books? It is well known that Franklin sent out a world of books from his establishment in Philadelphia, beginning in 1732. In 1747 the remarkable press of the Ephrata Brotherhood was set up. During the suc-

<sup>19</sup> Colonial Records; First Series; Vol. 1, pp. 95-96.

<sup>20</sup>The first number of the "Boston NewsSeller," the first newspaper printed on the Western Hemisphere was issued on April 24, 1704.

ceeding fifty years nearly a hundred publications were printed—and mostly written—in that German community in the forest. Among them is that splendid folio of 1,512 pages the "Martyrer Spiegel," the largest book printed in America up to that time, 1748-9. If we again turn towards Philadelphia, we find Christopher Saur set up his press in Germantown, in 1739, and began not only the issue of a German newspaper, but of books also, and in 1743 sent out that handsome German quarto bible, the first bible printed in any European language in North America, and antedating any New England edition by 39 years. But that splendid specimen of typography was not the only volume sent out from the Saur press. Christopher Saur, the elder, published 180 different works, not counting the issues of weekly, monthly and semi-monthly periodicals. His son and successor, Christopher Saur, sent out 160 different publications. If we reckon the editions to have averaged 1,500 copies each—some were of 2,500 and 3,000—the number of books sent out to their German fellow-citizens, by these two publishers alone, would collectively amount to 510,000 copies. If the German colonists were the illiterate boors a few stupid writers have declared them, what use had they for this half a million books sent out from this single press? The assertion is grossly and inexcusably inaccurate.

What is more, with true Teutonic persistency, there has been an unbroken chain of Saurs at the same business until this very hour, and a Sower is to-day at the head of a publishing house with about 5,000,000 books to his credit.<sup>21</sup> Can we observe any sign of decadence there?

Nowhere were there so many newspapers printed as in Pennsylvania. Several years ago I undertook to compile a bibliography of the newspapers published in the German county of Lancaster. I found over 140 in the city of Lancaster alone, and have since increased the number to more than 150. Eight of these were issued prior to 1800; the earliest in 1752. No other city in the world with a population of only 40,000 can

<sup>21</sup> I am indebted to Chas. Christopher Saur of the "Sower Publishing Company" for these facts.

show such a record. Including the county, the list extends to more than 225.

If the Palatine immigrant was an ignorant boor, why was even the poorest accompanied by his Bible and catechism when he came here? What use had such men for books? The question answers itself. If they were unfriendly to education, then tell me why the school house arose simultaneously with the modest house of worship as often as the latter made its appearance? Was not the first work of pedagogy written in Pennsylvania by Christopher Dock, who wielded the birch in a Mennonite school on the Skippack, as early as 1718?<sup>22</sup> Was not the University of Pennsylvania, than which there is none greater either north or south, founded as early as 1740? Was not Franklin College founded in 1787? Although one of our historians says it has ceased to exist,<sup>23</sup> yet under its revived name it has during the present year graduated a class almost equal in number, I have reason to believe, to the total number of students within its walls at any one time during its early history. Does that look as if the builders of this mighty commonwealth were indifferent to education? "The Germans, unlike as they might be in manners to the people of English descent, were not deficient in intellect or religious sincerity."<sup>24</sup>

What is the situation to-day in this Quaker-Palatine State, so far as education goes? We have 13 Theological Seminaries; 4

<sup>22</sup> Although written in 1750, this little treatise of 54 octavo pages was not published until Christopher Saur gave it to the world in 1770. The title is: "Eine Einfältige und grundlich abgefasste Schul-ordnung darinnen deutlich vorgestellt wird, auf welche weisse die Kinder nicht nur in denen in Schulen gewöhnlichen Lehren bestens angebracht Sondern auch in der Lehre Gottseligkeit wohl unterrichtet werden möegen aus Liebe zu dem menschlichen Geschlecht auf gesetzt durch den wohlerfahren und lang geneübten Schulmeister Christoph Dock; und durch einige Freunde des gemeinen Bestens dem Druck uebergeben Germantown, Gedruckt und zu finden bey Christoph Saur, 1770." See Judge Pennypacker's translation of this book, as well as a most interesting sketch of Christopher Dock and his work, in his "Historical and Biographical Sketches."

<sup>23</sup> Hildreth's History of the United States, First Series, Vol. III., p. 386.

<sup>24</sup> Dr. George P. Fisher, *The Colonial Era*, p. 270.

Schools of Dental Surgery; 7 Medical Colleges; 28 Scholastic Colleges; 13 Normal Schools, numbering 7,484 students and more than 150,000 graduates; 3 Law Schools and 75 Seminaries and Collegiate Institutes. Of Public Schools we have 26,000, with property worth \$50,000,000; we pay \$10,000,000 in salaries to teachers; our State appropriates \$5,500,000 annually to the same good cause, and our total expenses for public school purposes is \$20,000,000. In these free schools 1,100,000 pupils are to-day securing a free education. There are a quarter of a million more pupils in the free schools of Pennsylvania, than in all the schools of New England collectively.

I will be pardoned if I digress for a few moments to relate how the people whom Parkman, Lamb, Sargent and others nearer home have designated as ignorant boors, exhibited those traits in the last century. Some twenty years ago, while investigating a similar question, I unearthed the record book of a school established in 1786 in my native village by the people then living there. The originator of the movement was the Rev. Mr. Melzheimer. Two subscription papers were circulated among the people, one in English, the other in German. There were 133 original contributors, besides some who came into the movement later. £109.10.9 were raised in that way. But that was not all. There were many who had no money, but were nevertheless, anxious to help along the good cause. There are lists showing that these people contributed lime, sand, logs and much other building material. Others lent their personal services in digging the cellar and at other labor. These services are gratefully recorded, and as the board of these men was given by the neighbors we are told that "the cellar was completed with little or no charge." After the building was erected, certain carpenters gave their labor gratis, to make desks and benches. A firm of German printers, "Mess. Steiner, Albright & Laun, of the borough of Lancaster, were so kind and obliging, as to print free of charge, about eighty hymns to be distributed among the people, and to be sung by the school youth in vocal musical order." On the day when the completed school was dedicated there was a

grand jubilee. The members of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, and the officers of the same, several religious societies, and others, in all 700 persons, proceeded to the school building, where an oration and a sermon were delivered. Thus was that log college, 30 x 40 feet, with its single professor, built. In 1857 it was sold. The money received for it was invested, and since that time the interest is devoted to keeping open the borough school two months in every year, after the regular free school has been closed. My earliest school days were passed in that log schoolhouse, and even now, as often as I think of those long-gone days, I recall and bless the memories of the men whose enlightened liberality made all this possible.

“Do bin Ieh ganga in die Schul,  
Wo Ieh noch war ganz Kle ;  
Dort war dar Meschter in seim Stuhl ;  
Dort war sei Wip, un' dort sei Ruhl—  
Ich kan's noch alles seh !”<sup>25</sup>

Not so bad for the Quaker and Palatine, especially when we remember the five states which now represent the southern colonies have collectively only as many normal schools as we have, and the six New England states only 24, and that the pupils in our 13 schools are nearly as many as those in these eleven states. All New England has only 19 colleges with 11,616 students; the five southern states 54 with 9,110 students; Pennsylvania alone has 10,149 in her colleges. The population of all New England is only 4,700,000 while that of Pennsylvania is 5,258,014, and yet New England is one and a half times as large as Pennsylvania, and the five colonies of the South nearly five times as large. These are very significant facts, and speak in unmistakable language of Pennsylvania’s supremacy in this department. I will not pursue this educational feature any further except to say, it was that loyal knight and cavalier, Sir William Berkeley, Governor of Virginia, who said, “Thank God! there are no free schools, nor printing presses (in Virginia), and I hope there will be none for a hundred years.”<sup>26</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Dr. Henry Harbaugh, “Das alt Schulhaus on der Krick.”

<sup>26</sup> See Governor Berkeley’s reply to a series of questions submitted to him by the Plantation Committee of the Privy Council in 1671; Hildreth’s His., Vol. I., p. 524.

There is still another accusation that has time and again been brought against these Quakers and Palatines—that of a lack of patriotism, of indifference to the cause of independence during the Revolution. It is indisputable that as true children of Britain, the Quakers were in the beginning attached to the cause of the Crown. But were not a majority of all the people of the same way of thinking before hostilities actually broke out? Were not the members of the Church of England loyalists almost to a man? Was there not an indifference to the idea of independence among the people generally? Were not many of the "signers" in our State, and out of it, opposed to separation at the outset of that contest? Was it not the most natural thing in the world therefore, that the Quakers, who were non-resistants, should dread the conflict of arms and array themselves on the side of peace?

Up to the outbreak of hostilities the Germans had little share in the government. They did not understand the English language, and were besides indifferent, if not averse, to taking an active part in politics. The sect people, the Mennonites, Moravians and others, were like the Quakers, opposed to the calling of arms. They walked the paths of peace and sought to avoid those of war, if possible. But they were nevertheless patriots of the truest stamp, as the progress of the contest with Great Britain fully revealed. Patriotism that is deserving of the name is not created at the political hustings nor on the Fourth of July. It must be drawn from the mother's breast and learned at the father's knee.

But not all were non-resistants. Calvinists, Lutherans and others, men whose sires had bared their breasts in the struggle which Protestantism waged in the Old World, sprang to arms in this land of their adoption with an alacrity that bears strong contrast with many of English birth, not Quakers, who covertly or openly lent aid and encouragement to Britain. The German county of Lancaster sent nine regiments into that uneven contest, besides minor organizations. When a special call was made for troops, was not an exclusively German regiment raised in Pennsylvania and Maryland, and is it not so recorded in our histories?

As a lad, I remember to have stood times without number at an aged grandsire's knees, listening with a swelling heart as he told me how he, a volunteer for the war, carried the flag of the young republic over the wintry waters of the majestic Delaware and into the glorious conflict at Trenton; how he carried it through that hot midsummer day at Monmouth and over the ensanguined snows at Valley Forge. Tell me not there was a lack of sincere devotion and loyalty to the new-born flag. The tears that gathered in those sightless eyes, as these "tales of times of old" fell from his lips, proudly yet modestly, have burned themselves into my memory, and there they will live forever. To say these men were disloyal to state and country is to dishonor both them and us, their offspring. I resent the imputation with all the vigor of thought and speech of which I am master.

Even though the Quaker was, on principle, opposed to the use of arms and taking of oaths, when he came to carry on a government on his own account, he found that he could not well get along without doing both. James Logan, in 1741, wrote a long letter to the Yearly Meeting favoring defensive warfare. Not a few of the young men of Quaker stock broke away from the old-time principle of these men of peace. John Wynne was a Tory, but Hugh Wynne was a patriot and a soldier. The "Quaker Blues" and "The Greens" or "Silk Stocking Company," so famous at the Revolutionary period bear testimony that the fighting Quaker was on hand and ready to do his part of the work. Pennsylvania contributed one Quaker general to the Continental army, and another Quaker, General Green, by universal consent, stands by the side of the Commander-in-Chief as the born soldier of the Revolution. Do the 22,198 Continentals and 7,857 militia that Pennsylvania gave to that great war of the centuries mean nothing? Graydon says, "Had all the other provinces done as much in proportion to their ability, and the men been enlisted for the war, we might have avoided the hair-breadth escapes that ensued."<sup>27</sup>

What need to pursue these investigations further? We must

<sup>27</sup>Graydon's Memoirs, Chap. 5, p. 132.

agree with Jonathan Edwards that "The wheels of Providence are not turned about by blind chance." Even thus we believe it to have been here in Pennsylvania. The establishment of the Quaker and Palatine in this modern Canaan was part and parcel of that grand system of Divine world government that had its origin ere the world was or the morning stars sang together. As the settlement of Pennsylvania was not a sudden impulse on the part of Penn, but the outcome of a moral and political growth in him, so was the greatness and grandeur of this State the result of the fortuitous blending of races. Quakers and Germans went to almost every other colony, but the people they found there were unlike themselves in thought, in custom and in creed. Exclusiveness, narrow-mindedness and sectarianism everywhere prevailed. They found no congenial stock whereon they might engraft themselves, no laws that welcomed alike the men of every clime and offered to all untrammeled political freedom. Here none were excluded on pain of death as in New England. There was security to life and to property, and every favorable condition of human existence possible among men was theirs. Labor was honorable and universal. "Let my children be husbandmen and housewives," wrote Penn.<sup>28</sup> McMaster tells us that among the Cavaliers, "toil was the only thing from which the rich planter abstained."<sup>29</sup> Mark the contrast!

Need we wonder that ours is the grandest State among them all. It is strange that three of the first seven richest agricultural counties in the Union are in this State—Lancaster, Chester and Bucks. Latterly much has been heard of a certain "endless chain," used in a financial sense. There is another endless chain in existence among the substantial yeomen in the German counties of this State. While many of New England's sons have sold or abandoned their ancient acres and sought new homes in other States, the lands of these first Palatine immigrants still remain in the possession of their descendants, held by ancient indentures,

<sup>28</sup>Letter of Penn to his family when he sailed for Pennsylvania in 1682.

<sup>29</sup>John Bach McMaster, *Hist. of the People of the United States*, Vol. I., p. 70.

supplemented by an endless chain of fresh titles from father to son, reaching backward to the original patents of Penn. The principles that guided and the laws that directed the people who came here and lived under them, were the mighty factors that have made us the Keystone of the national arch. There could be no other outcome. It was cause and effect working out their natural sequence in the broad field of commonwealth building. The spirit of narrow-minded sectionalism has hitherto obscured or kept these truths in the background. They cannot be kept there longer. The truth of history demands that they shall be brought to the light. And they will be. The spirit of investigation is abroad and men demand that the truth shall be told, even though the Puritan be dethroned from his pedestal of self laudation and the Cavalier from his station of self-complacent arrogance and pride.

The years will come and go. The ever-changing, ever-shifting drama of human existence will ebb and flow and may have much to reveal in the days that are still to come. But never again, do I believe, will be seen upon this lower earth, a return of that pastoral simplicity of life, that reverence for lofty ideals, that innate sense of right, that devotion to duty as they understood it, that matchless prosperity, that forbearance and charity which combined in the Quaker and Palatine and made Pennsylvania at once grand and great, the ideal Province of the New World. The might of their influence has given direction to our political existence through two centuries and is potential in our national thought to-day ; not even the fires of the final change shall sweep it away utterly.

## II.

### THE CHANGES IN THE CONCEPTION OF THE SUPERNATURAL AS AFFECTED BY THE PROG- RESS OF SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE.

BY GEO. W. RICHARDS.

Several of the terms of this subject must be considered before we can proceed to an intelligent discussion. The word supernatural is more easily analyzed than defined. Super, above; natura, nature; the word, accordingly, refers to that mode of being which is above nature. A theology is crystallized in the term. It contains a *weltanschaung* which has dominated the minds of men for centuries. If we knew exactly the boundaries of nature, we might trace the lines of the supernatural. To avoid an endless discussion, however, in defining the word, we shall substitute the word God or Spirit, as involving essentially what is meant by the supernatural. The problem before us, then is, the relation of God to nature, spirit to matter, the infinite to the finite. How has the progress of scientific knowledge affected our conception of this relation?

Then, again, we should not forget that the *conception* of the supernatural is at stake, not the supernatural itself. Astronomy changed our conception of the planets in their relation to the sun, but never changed that relation itself. Science cannot make God: neither can it unmake Him. A god, the notion of whom could not be vindicated in the face of scientific speculations, would hardly be worshipped as the creator of worlds and the ruler of nations. This assurance will at once relieve the tension upon the nerves of those fearful saints, who are always trembling for the Ark of God as it is drawn down the grooves of time.

Scientific knowledge is the knowledge of things in their relations, obtained by the application of the scientific method. But

what is the scientific method? We cannot understand the movement of science without the method. Its scope and purpose may be better explained by a comparison with two other methods of inquiry—the speculative and the theological. Bascom thus sums up the mission of each method: “Science presents the facts of the world; philosophy interprets them in terms of reason; and religion in terms of spiritual life.” When applied to nature, the theological method is an attempt to interpret nature through a dogma; the speculative method is the definition of nature through a principle; and the scientific method is an explanation of nature through facts. In other words, it is a study of nature through nature; not through a book, nor through a system.

Before the sixteenth century the Bible was read through a theology, and nature through the Bible. Whatever direct observations were made were cut long or cut short, to fit the procrustean bed of ecclesiastical doctrine. After the Reformation, under the impulse of the new freedom of thought and expression, a brilliant effort was made to solve the mysteries of the universe by the speculative philosophers of Germany. They interpreted God, Man and the Universe by metaphysics. The reign of metaphysics was followed by a reaction in favor of physics. Empirical investigations supplanted metaphysical speculation. The era of natural science began, promoted by the definiteness of its objects, the mathematical exactness of its results, and by its utilitarian value.\*

Through the application of this method of research we have gained a new and true conception of nature—of the material and psychical world. A new conception of the natural means, also, a new conception of the supernatural. A new phenomenal involves a new noumenal. The invisible things of Him, since the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made.† The things made, the visible, science has carefully observed, analyzed, classified and related. As the visible

\* Am. Journ. of Theol., April, 1898. Theol. of Albrecht Ritschl, by Stuckenbergh. P. 272.

† Rom. 1:20.

has been changed in the minds of men, the conception of the invisible will be correspondingly modified. The spiritual has always been conceived and expressed in parables of the reigning conception of the natural. Genesis could not rise above the science of the age. The writer had to present his sublime conception of God through the cosmogony of his time. Now, that we have an infinitely superior idea of creation, we have, also, a better medium for the expression of the Creator.

If it is true, then, that changed conceptions of nature require changed conceptions of the supernatural, the question arises, How has the scientific method affected our conceptions of nature? The answer to this question determines the solution of the second, How has scientific knowledge of the natural affected the conception of the supernatural?

I. For ages scholars were enthralled by the geocentric theory of the universe. They lived in a limited and restricted world. They had no idea of the magnitude of the heavens and the size of the earth. The Hebrews pictured the sky as a solid vault, firmamentum, resting at its extremities upon the earth. (Job. 26:11.) In this vault the heavenly bodies were imagined to revolve; in front of it (that is in open air below its lower surface) the birds flew, Gen. 1:20; above it were reservoirs, in which rain was stored, and above these waters above the firmament Jehovah sat enthroned.\* In the Iliad, Homer sings of

“The ocean,  
From which all the rivers and all the seas,  
And all the streams and springing brooks flow forth.”

The earth, for him, was a flat disc encircled by the ocean. The monk Cosmas, a geographical authority of the Middle Ages, believed that the earth was of a long, narrow, rectangular shape, surrounded by a high wall and that towards the north pole were high mountains, round which the suns, planets and stars revolved.† Connected with these crude views of the universe were their narrow, materialistic conceptions of God.

\* Driver's Coment. on Amos, p. 21.

† Geikie's Hours, p. 111., Vol. 1.

What a change the heliocentric system has produced in the thinking and the imagination of men we can now scarcely conceive. It amounted to nothing less than a new world, and, though they may not have felt it then, it involved a new conception of God. Copernicus was the pioneer of the scientific age. He readjusted the planets of the solar system and changed the geography of the skies. The earth was no longer central, around which the heavens turned. She was merely a fractional part of a vast system, traveling with her companions around the sun. The fixed stars were discovered to be suns, with their own planets, rivaling in size and import our own solar system. The circle of the heavens, upon which Jehovah was enthroned, was broken. The firmament above the earth was dissolved. Space was infinitely extended.

In the footsteps of Copernicus came the famous astronomer, Kepler, who traced the orbits of the planets. After patient observation and study he formulated his first law of elliptical orbits. He noticed the times of their revolutions and the distances from the sun. From these data he determined the relation existing between the times of revolution and the mean distances from the sun. These investigations prepared the way for the great Newton.

Hitherto little was known of the forces and modes of operation in the stellar world. The supernatural had so engaged the minds of men that they had little care for the natural. To attempt to pry into these mysteries was almost an insult to God. The biblical accounts of creation and sustentation were literally accepted and held without question. By the fall of an apple Newton discovered the force of gravity. He found it, or at least believed it, to be a universally operating force. He not only found the force, but enunciated the law of its operation. Not the agency of personal angels, but gravitation, was found to support the vast system of the heavens. The whole cosmos was subject to this law. This gave not only a new conception of *the extension of space*, but of *the relations and forces* existing in space.

These discoveries, of course, revolutionized the views of the

universe in its present form. The problem of its origin—its becoming—was not touched. It was generally and finally accepted that all things were created directly in their present form by the divine word. The notion of omnipotence accounted for the instantaneous production of the worlds, physically and spiritually. Still, some bolder than the rest, proposed hypotheses for the explanation of the origin of the universe. La Place applied the nebular hypothesis already suggested by Kant. By a system of mathematical and physical laws he demonstrated the possibility of the origin of the planets from a primal, nebular world stuff. The subsequent light of the spectroscope confirmed the hypothesis. Geologists, also, began to examine the strata of the earth. Another Genesis was found written upon the rocks. Cuvier, the paleontologist, distinguished ten or fifteen main periods in the history of the earth, each of which had a fauna and flora of its own. True to his Bible, he tried to solve the difficulty by independent acts of creation succeeding the great upheavals and cataclysms of nature. Sir Charles Lyell, however, repudiated the theory of catastrophes as untenable. He showed in his *Principles of Geology* that it was unnecessary to have recourse to supernatural causes and universal catastrophes to explain the structure of mountains, and accordingly of the earth in general. The ordinary causes which are now transforming and reconstructing the earth are amply sufficient to explain these phenomena.

In this way the gradual evolution of the inorganic world was explained. In spite of their dogmas, men accepted the discoveries of science and harmonized the two as best they could. The higher realm of organic life, however, was still a mystery. Botanists and zoologists studied the existing orders, genera and species. The former classified the plants, the latter the animals. Paleontology widened the field of research and the work of comparative botany and zoölogy began. Striking resemblances and differences were marked between the past and the present. The idea of derivation was suggested by some scholars, *i. e.*, the idea of one form being derived from the preceding. God was thus far supposed to have created the first individual or pair of each spe-

cies. These may have become extinct, or may have been modified as individuals, but the species remained. The four thousand species of plants found by Linnaeus made the doctrine difficult to believe. The two hundred thousand species of Arthropoda and the eighty thousand species of Coleoptera, since discovered, have not removed the difficulty.

Biology now began its course of investigations. The laws of life—reproduction, environment and heredity—were carefully studied. With many important forerunners, Charles Darwin startled the world when he announced, and, by an almost irresistible array of facts, gathered after the most patient research of twenty years, proved the Origin of Species, not by immediate divine creation, but by a process of gradual development. Haeckel says: "The whole is based on the simple fundamental idea that the struggle for existence in nature modifies organisms and produces new species by the aid of the same means by which man produces domesticated varieties of animals and plants." That was coming near to taking the prerogative of creation out of God's hands altogether, according to the views of creation then prevalent.

Man alone was now left for God's special creative activity. Darwin himself at first believed that an entirely peculiar place in the creation must be assigned to man. But so early as 1863, Huxley applied the theory of evolution to man also, in his essay entitled "Man's Place in Nature." Not until 1871 did Darwin complete his work and apply his law to the human form in the "Descent of Man."

What Newton did for space, Darwin did for time. The former removed the limits of space, the latter of time. Chaos became cosmos. Law was found pervading the intricate system of the universe. Space was infinitely expanded. Time was eternally prolonged. The process of things was explained, but their essence still remained an inscrutable mystery. For as the circle of science enlarges, the borders of nescience expand. Youmans properly said: "The two deepest scientific principles now known of all those relating to material things are the laws of gravitation and

of evolution." The former eliminates caprice from the government of the cosmos. God no longer worked from without upon the planets, like the engineer upon the engine; but from within, like the soul in the body. The latter proved a continuous order in the formation of worlds. The idea of the instantaneous was exchanged for the gradual; the mechanical for the organic.

Abstractly stated, the scientific method has given profounder meaning to the innate demand of reason expressed by philosophy for unity in the diversity of phenomena, and expressed by religion for monotheism out of the multiplicity of polytheism. This demand is met through the universal reign of law. The sum-total of things is animated by a plan which evolves in the form of truth, beauty and goodness. It is rational, satisfying the reason. It is moral, satisfying religion. Both the rational and moral must center in personality, and personality is fully expressed in the triune God.\*

We can appreciate the panic in the camps of orthodoxy produced by the invasion of scientific knowledge. It could not be otherwise. Instead of revealing the weakness of men, it shows their fidelity to convictions. Although they were in error, when they tried to suppress the results of scientific investigation, they were, nevertheless, in dead earnest in defending their God and their faith. We should remember this when we take an estimate of the "Warfare of Science with Theology."

No less a scholar than Gladstone declared in an address at Liverpool that, "Upon the grounds of what is termed evolution, God is relieved of the labor of creation; in the name of unchangeable laws He is discharged from governing the world." A distinguished clergymen declared Darwinism as "an attempt to dethrone God." Another said, "According to Darwin, God is dead." The broad assertion was made, "If the Darwinian theory is true, Genesis is a lie; the whole framework of the Book of Life falls to pieces; and the revelation of God to man, as we Christians know it, is a delusion and a snare." There is truth

\* This thought runs through the article on "The Christian Doctrine of God," by Aubrey Moore, in *Lux Mundi*.

in this statement. The conception of God as these men held it was in great danger of subversion. Their conception of Genesis might be called a "lie" if the Darwinian theory is true. "The whole framework of the Book of Life," as then conceived, does fall to pieces in the light of the new discoveries.

Science is undoubtedly in conflict with theology, but not with God. Theories have vanished with their authors, but God remains God forever. What we need is a readjustment of our conceptions of God or the supernatural in the light of the undoubted facts and truths of science. This is simply a repetition of a process through which Christianity has passed before. When the simple gospel came from the land of its birth into the boundaries of Greece, it had to meet the claims of the philosophic mind. It was adequate to the task. Philosophy found peace in the Incarnate Logos. In like manner must the gospel assimilate and subdue unto itself the results of the scientific movement. It must be interpreted and proclaimed in the light of each particular age.\*

\* We agree with a statement in the REVIEW of Jan., 1883, by a prominent contributor to its pages :

"As regards the fundamental facts of Christianity, these, in the very nature of the case, are eternally the same, and must be received by all who are accounted true believers and heirs of everlasting life. \* \* \* But it is different as regards the scientific, or systematic, apprehension of these facts and doctrines. The theology of the Church does not remain the same, but necessarily is constantly more or less changing. For what satisfies the intellectual wants of one person or age will never altogether satisfy those of a different person or a different age. For different persons vary in their intelligence and power of comprehension, and different ages in their intellectual tendencies and in their point of vision; so that the same things will often be seen by them in a different light."

Christian Unity, by Rev. J. M. Titzel, D.D., REFORMED QUARTERLY, Jan., 1883.

We are in accord, also, with the liberal views expressed in the same article by the author: "Man is constitutionally a thinking being, and, therefore, is impelled by his very nature to think and to inquire into the causes and relations of things, and it is only in this way that truth becomes his actual possession. A church or an individual without any theology would be without any truth; and a church or an individual with a finished theology may be said to be moribund. What is needed is not less theology, but more humility and charity, a fuller apprehension of the fact that the finite cannot gauge the

II. We must now inquire into the prevailing conception of the supernatural. Then we may trace the changes necessary for an adaptation of the old supernatural to the new natural. The two concepts underlying the *popular* view of God are *transcendence* and *anthropomorphism*. These determine the conceptions of God, as Creator and Upholder of the universe. The Deity is enthroned above the clouds ; angels and archangels surround Him. The host of the redeemed sing psalms of praise in endless strains. From his throne of glory God controls the sun and the systems. He presides over the affairs of men. The power which He wields in creation and providence is external. He molds the plastic clay into form and the worlds are sent spinning out of His hands in their orbits in space. After all things were finished He retired into his sabbatic rest, from which He views creation with complacency and pronounces it good. If at any time His assistance is needed in the running of the world, He breaks through the web of natural law and, by miraculous force, sets things right again. This latter form of activity is specifically divine and supernatural.

Upon this conception of God depend the popular views of revelation, salvation and judgment. Messages are sent from heaven through angels or painted in visions upon clouds. These are received by the chosen prophets of God as a telegram from the skies and made known to the world. In this way prophecy has read the chart of God for milleniums to come. The Cuban war may be the fulfilment of a particular verse in Daniel. Their message coming from God is, of course, infallible and admits of no criticism or questions. A "Thus saith Lord" stops the mouth and binds the reason for all time to come.

Salvation becomes a translation into the celestial fields of bliss.

infinite, and that different views concerning a subject are not necessarily conflicting, and a more earnest and conscientious seeking after truth for its own sake. \* \* \* Theological discussion, when it is earnest and honest, always in the end promotes the cause of truth. It is not, therefore, something that should be altogether discouraged and relegated to the list of things wholly undesirable. Nor when properly conducted need it array men bitterly one against the other, or hinder them from holding sweet communion together in the house of God." Above Art., p. 118.

The penalty of sin is paid. The wrath of God is satisfied, and the sinner goes scot free into the home of the saints. He must, indeed, believe certain facts, subscribe certain theories, and then eventually, when he dies, he is instantaneously transformed into a saint, seated by the throne of the Eternal. In some quarters this is the prerogative of the few elect. God is even a partial monarch, who takes pleasure, for the sake of His glory, in damning a great multitude of His creatures.

Judgment is not recognized in the current events of the age. It is deferred until the last day. It is regarded as *merely* the far-off divine event to which all creation moves. Then the heavens and earth shall be destroyed. The Book of Life shall be opened. The debit and credit accounts are balanced and the wages are paid. This is the assertion of a truth at the expense of another truth equally important. The transcendence is unduly emphasized as over against the immanence of God.

III. The discoveries of science compel us to modify the idea of a localized heaven above the firmament.\* God is more than a great king seated upon a throne, ruling worlds. We question whether this conception is not pervaded by a subtle materialism. Whether Judaism was not as materialistic as modern science is not as easily answered as we at first sight suppose. Telescopes have swept the fields of space. Nowhere does matter end and spirit begin. Matter, however subtle and refined, pervades all space. The idea of God as spirit and the discovery of space as practically infinite will not permit us to hold to the *former conception* of a transcendent king.

Revelation is no longer regarded as a magical disclosure, but as profound ethical apprehension of the Divine in the physical and moral order of life. The same laws, which hold in the knowledge

\* "The right hand of God, however, is not bound to a particular place and in any case is not to be taken literally, but denotes His almighty power, as it upholds and fills the whole universe. When we pray to our Father in heaven we do not hereby deny His presence on earth, nor conceive of Him as in the strict sense seated upon a throne in some definite locality above us. This would indeed be a most gross and fleshly notion of God, the Omnipotent, Absolute Spirit." "What is Church History," by Schaff, p. 33.

of one person by another, are operative in the knowledge man has of God. Visions and stone tablets, external to the life of the seer, would have little effect on the mind and heart of the individual or nation. An infallible dictator of truth to the inspired penman would contradict the laws of God's noblest workmanship—the human mind. The Spirit of truth may not be limited to Sinai or Sion. The boundaries of Canaan did not imprison Him. The whole race is God's child and the object of His love. In the consciousness of humanity God is at work and imparts His life. There are some chosen spirits who are *more obedient* and, therefore, *more recipient* souls. These become in a special sense the promulgators of the Law and the Prophets. So there are, also, nations who are especially called to be the bearers of divine revelation, chief among whom were the Israelites. Yet, while the fullness of time was approaching in Judea, the springtime of a new era was coming among the Gentiles. They, too, had their prophets preparing the way for the Christ.

Salvation is not a forensic transaction by which God is satisfied through sacrificial blood. It is an ethical, though divine process, through the assimilation of truth, which consummates itself in life. The keystone of the Augustinian system is removed. Theories of election are renounced. Views of damnation and hell are changed. By an internal process, to which all the services of the sanctuary are tributary, and by a consistent life of law and love, humanity is moving to its ultimate goal. Chastisements are necessary. Offences must come. Through great tribulation mankind is entering the Kingdom of God.

"They say

The solid earth whereon we tread  
In tracts of fluent heat began,  
And grew to seeming—random forms,  
The seeming prey of cyclic storms,  
Till at the last arose the man.

"Who threwe and branched from clime to clime,  
The heralds of a higher race,  
And of himself in higher place,  
And if so he type the work of time.

"Within himself, from more to more :  
 Or crowned with attributes of woe  
 Like glories move his course, and show  
 That life is not an idle ore,

'But iron dug from central gloom,  
 And heated hot with burning fears,  
 And dipp'd in baths of hissing tears,  
 And battered with the shocks of doom

"To shape and use. Arise and fly  
 The reeling faun, the sensual feast :  
 Move upward, working out the beast,  
 And let the ape and tiger die."

We might thus summarize the conception of the supernatural. Commonly the supernatural was conceived as power exercised by God without the intervention of means.\* That which could be accounted for by laws was natural; what was effected by direct divine agency was supernatural. We can see how the discoveries of science—the reign of universal law—undermined this theory of the supernatural. Each step in advance, on the part of the scientific pioneers, was a limitation of God's activity in the world. Inherent forces were recognized. But these had to be assisted and overruled by an exterior power, exerted from beyond the chain of cause and effect. That part of the operation was for God's special glory. The balance was regarded even as an evil and combatting the divine ends.

Gravitation and evolution reunited God and the world. The gulf was bridged. The exiled Lord was returned to his throne. He is allowed the regency of things from eternity and His mode of working is discerned. He is recognized through the infinities. All nature is actuated by God. The supernatural may be called the internatural. The sharp distinction between the natural and the supernatural is vanishing. Now, we may say, all is natural. Then, all is supernatural, but, always, all is controlled by God. The honors are no longer divided between nature and God. For God not only works *in* nature or *through* nature, but, as one of our own theologians says, "*He works nature.*"

\* The Reign of Law, by Duke of Argyll, p. 9.

Neither are these laws subordinate deities—demigods—which detract from the glory of God. They are His ministering angels, His *materialized volitions*, through which His ultimate purpose is revealed and attained.

These truths will affect the practical religious life. Under the old creative idea “man’s chief spiritual function is that of prayer, his chief grace that of patience and his chief hope that of intervention. The changes of the world are to be great, convulsive, to extend from above downward and to issue in a new heavens and a new earth. The concepts of a slow constant and perfectly coherent growth and that of a sudden and unforeseen intervention are very different. It’s the transition from the idea of waiting on God to working with Him, from a relatively blind dependence on inexplicable providence to a perfectly rational coöperation with a wise and comprehensive method. It involves undoubtedly a passage from a lower to a higher conception of God.”\*

IV. But are we not surrendering the transcendence of God and losing Him in pantheism? Will not His personality and kinship with us be sacrificed by yielding His anthromorphism? That is the chief complaint against the new theology. It is a voice that must be heard and answered. Surely it is science falsely so-called that robs the race of a personal and a humanly related God. Sooner follow the most unscientific theology than the most scientific atheism. It falls upon the theologian to answer these questions and reconcile the apparent contradictions. It is not the work of the scientist.

The whole problem involves a readjustment of the two ancient ideas—the transcendence and the immanence of God. Both unduly emphasized lead to practical atheism, the one through deism, the other through pantheism. A God, who is not more than His world, and confined in it, will not hold His own among men. A God, who is infinitely removed from His world, cannot draw the world unto Himself. He must be transcendent. He must be immanent.

\* Evolution and Religion, by Bascom, pp. 79, 80.

Our conceptions of transcendence and immanence, however, will have to change. Hitherto they have been physical and spatial. Time and space have been obstacles in the conception of the spiritual. These are not forms for ethical ideas. Thoughts and virtues are formless, immaterial. We cannot measure them or weigh them. Yet we have always imagined that transcendence required a local and physical habitat beyond the natural. This was due to a materialistic view of the supernatural.

Immanuel Fichte\* lays down an axiom as a basis for his discussion in his *Theistische Weltansicht*. "Die höchste welt uhrsache kann nur richtig aus der höchsten welt thatsache erkant werden," "The first world cause can be properly known only by the last world fact." This principle enables us to form a much higher conception of the relation between matter and spirit than has so far prevailed. The highest world fact is man. In man, too, we have the best type of the relation between matter and mind. Instead of going to the potter moulding the clay, or the mechanic constructing the engine, for our parable of God, we come to man and find in miniature the laws which hold between God and the material universe.

Man's constitution affords only an analogy, for we cannot solve the mystery even of his nature. Yet it is the best analogy through which to express the highest relations of spirit and matter. The soul of man is immanent. It works in and through the body. We cannot say that it is in any one organ. It is in every organ of the body. Yet the limbs may be amputated and the soul is not destroyed or diminished. It is more closely related to the brain and heart, and yet not located in either of these. Are we guilty of panpsychism when we make this assertion? Do we *identify* soul and body? May not the soul be more than the body and yet be in the body? The soul is more than the body. It transcends it, not, indeed, by hovering over it and controlling it from without. *The transcendence is not local.*†

\* J. W. Nevin not only studied I. H. Fichte's writings, but quoted them with approval. See *Art. Christianity and Humanity*, Oct., 1873, p. 471.

† "The two worlds, natural and spiritual, form together one universe; and the union of nature and mind in man serves to show, with a sort of palpable

In the same way God dwells and works in His world. He is everywhere present, in the rock, in the flower, in the babe. We could not confine Him to a place any more than we can locate the soul. Some say this is pantheism. True, if God is refined matter and partakes of material qualities, then he must be spread in the form of a sublimated vapor through every substance. But there is substance which is not material and comes not under these categories. He is spiritual and ethical. As such He is not nature, though in it. He transcends nature, though working continually through it. He, too, is the essential of matter and life and the necessary complement of the material universe. Withdraw God from the world and you have a gigantic corpse, subject to dissolution and death. He is verily the life of the world.

God is spirit. "Now it was long ago known that all the qualities of matter are what the mind makes them and have no existence as such apart from mind. In the deepest sense all that we really know is mind and, as Clifford would say, what we call the material universe is simply an imperfect picture in our minds of a real universe of mind stuff."\* Spirit, as such, needs some material center through which it acts. Pure spirit the human mind cannot comprehend. It must be mediated through matter. The contents of God, the ultimate spirit, are revealed through the material universe. The atom has a spiritual nucleus. It be-

demonstration, how they stand related each to the other in this cosmical whole. Their connection is not one of space or time. It transcends altogether these limitations. The spiritual world is not outside of the natural locally nor does it come after this temporarily. \* \* \* The relation between the two orders of existence is of one sort rather with that between soul and body in man; two modes of being which are totally distinct, while yet they work into each other everywhere as coexistent spheres in the general identity of his life. \* \* \* The spiritual world, it has been well said, works from within, and actuates all and each of the things that exist and are formed in the world of nature, as the human mind works into the senses and motions of the body; so that all the particular things of nature are, as it were, sheaths and coverings which encompass spiritual things and proximately produce effects corresponding to the end of God the Creator."—Christianity and Humanity, by J. W. Nevin, *Mercersburg Review*, Oct., 1873.

\* Idea of God, by Fiske, p. 153. This shows how science in the end leads towards the fundamental truths of Revelation.

comes a molecule and through it the spirit of nature creates suns, stars, planets. The cell is a vitalized molecule. It is a higher medium of spirit. It is the material of the blade, the tree, the beast. Man crowns the kingdom of nature. He is the last product and the highest medium of God. In the person of man, God finds a voice, like unto the voice of a child. In him His fulness may dwell, not physically, but ethically. The highest revelation came through the Divine Man, Jesus Christ. What throbbed in God from eternity was now heard in the accents of His Son. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ," Eph. 1:3.

It took ages before God as spirit was realized in the world. It will take eternities before He has perfectly manifested Himself. The infinite energy out of which all things proceed is spirit, which the apostle calls God. His personality is proven and demanded by every person, who proceeds out of Him. The last world fact is the revelation of the first world cause. But the primitive idea of personality will have to change. An attempt to define this difficult term, according to scientific views, is found in an answer to a question in the *Outlook*: What do you mean by a personal God? "By belief in a personal God we should say that Christians do not mean an embodied and localized Deity, dwelling in some central parts of the universe and ruling it therefrom like a king through messengers. What they do mean is that which Herbert Spencer calls an infinite eternal energy, and which composes what we call conscious life—the energy, which lies back of all phenomena and is manifested in and through all phenomena, is a spiritual energy, an energy that thinks, feels and wills. In other words, belief in the personality of God is belief in Christ's declaration: God is spirit."\*

This conception of personality conserves the truth of anthropomorphism. There must be that in God which is in man. Yet

\* Any definition of personality is tentative. No one would presume to speak dogmatically on this deepest of psychological problems. Yet, as Greek philosophers attempted a definition from their standpoint, modern scientists have done likewise without any final result.

there is that in God which is not in man. We, however, will always apprehend the fulness of God in the forms and conceptions of humanity. While in our present state, Jesus Christ is our image of the Deity—one whom we love, worship and obey. It does not necessarily follow that the conception of the first cause, the infinite eternal energy, must be limited to the form of a man incarnate.

His ethical nature, accordingly, admits of immanence without pantheism and transcendence without deism. Mind and will ally Him to human mind and will. These are akin to ours. We renounce a localized and carnal anthropomorphism, yet assert in a higher form His personality and His kinship to humanity.

If we read Mercersburg Theology aright, two principles are emphasized by which we may meet squarely the questions of the age. It directs us from the mechanical to the organic and from the forensic to the ethical.\* These two principles enable us to grapple with the problems of science and revelation. Through them we may find a point of union and a plane of harmony. We can only be true to our heritage as we are true to the application of these principles in the solution of the new questions of the age in which we live.

ALLENTOWN, PA.

\* For proof of this statement we would direct the reader to nearly every article produced by the Mercersburg School from the days of Rauch to Apple.

### III.

## CONSERVATIVE PROGRESS THE LAW OF HISTORY. (SECOND ARTICLE.)

BY REV. J. I. SWANDER, D.D.

Assuming the correctness of the position taken in this and our former article on the conservative continuity of history, especially as applicable to the one Apostolic and Catholic Church as the central channel of its onflow, some very proper questions are suggested, yea, actually forced to the front for respectful and candid consideration. These questions are addressed to Protestantism and call for Protestant replies. Not that they are new or have failed to receive considerate attention, thorough analysis and adequate answers in the past. They have been answered more or less directly and correctly by Thiersch, and to a good degree of comfort and satisfaction by Schaff in his *Principles of Protestantism* and his later *Vindication of the Idea of Historical Development*. The question may now be restated in a somewhat new form: Can Protestantism consistently and successfully defend the idea of historical development in its application to the Church as coming down through the dark ages of Romish corruption to the very dawn of the Reformation period? In such a line of defense of its own alleged legitimacy is it called upon to defend or even make special apology for the heresies in doctrine and corruptions in practice which had so generally crept into the Catholic Church before the day of its own birth and the beginning of its own responsibility? Is Protestantism any more virtuous by its attempts to make a virtue of the exposure, as did Ham, of a parent's nakedness? However much a virtuous son might deplore the drunkenness and consequent nakedness of his parent, yet in the spirit of filial obedience to the fourth Commandment he would, like Shem and Japheth, keep his face in another direc-

tion looking for a progeny more worthy and glorious than his ancestry. This course of conduct he would the more readily follow and could the more consistently pursue because the drunkenness of a parent does not necessarily call into question the legitimacy of the child. And yet what is the attitude of many of our most pious and learned teachers of historic theology? Are they not found in the ranks of those who seem to secure for themselves the enjoyment of superlative felicity by a proclamation of their own alleged illegitimacy as they declare their own ecclesiastical mother to be the mother of harlots? What an unnecessary, false and humiliating confession! Why do they not lift up their feeble knees and find a straighter path for their feet?

The same line of false argument when applied to the lineal descent of our Lord according to the flesh would lead with just as much sound logic to the conclusion that he was not the son of David and the lineal descendant of Abraham. What if Matthew and Luke had taken such view and followed such a course in recording the summary of historical facts pertaining to the genealogical relations of our Christ through more than a thousand years of Jewish Church history? Did Matthew turn aside from his line of duty as an inspired historian with an attempt to prove a breach in the line of historic development because of the shameful conduct of Judah with "a daughter of a certain Canaanite?" Did the writer of the first gospel narrative have any doubts as to Christ's legitimate descent from Abraham through the line of Messianic development because one of his maternal ancestresses was the harlot Rahab? Is it not probable that if Matthew had been as pure as much of the Puritanic side of Protestantism, and as zealously determined that nothing like a taint should appear in any of the ancestral links of the historic Christ, that he would have omitted to mention the names of Ruth the Moabitess and product of Lot's incest, as well as the names of David and Solomon as standing related to that terrible sin with Uriah's wife? But none of the holy men of inspired penmanship did any such thing; neither did they make any attempt in that direction. They

were not afraid of the logic of Almighty God as He in divine wisdom was thus weaving out its concrete syllogism in the warp and woof of Old Testament Church history. Is it not quite likely that if some of those who now deny the truth of the doctrine of historic development in the New Testament Church had lived in the Apostolic or primitive age with their *de novo* church theory they would have thrown up their hands with holy horror and charged the Apostles with Judaizing tendencies because forsooth they referred with full recognition to the historic past and to the fathers of whom according to the flesh Christ came?

Yet right here the advocates of this anti-historic theory fall back for once upon the Creed, for which they have just about as much proper respect as they have for the Church before the Reformation, and reply in the language of one of its articles that Christ, although He came of the wicked fathers according to the flesh, was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and therefore born immaculate. The point is well made and the position is tenable, but the objectors seem entirely forgetful of the promise made by that same historic and immaculate Christ that the gates of hell should not prevail against His historic Church ; that he would be with that Church always to the end of history, and that that same Spirit by which He was conceived should lead His Church into all truth. Why is that great promise forgotten and that great fact of history ignored ? Does not the power of the Highest overshadow the Redeemer's Bride and Lamb's wife as really as it did his mother ? Or was his first wife, after being overshadowed and guided into all truth and enabled to withstand the gates of hell for about the period of 500 years, permitted to run away into Babylonish apostasy to make room for another bride and new nuptials at the time of the Reformation ? Are not the foregoing questions fairly raised and fairly stated ? The subject is too grave and important to be treated with levity, and yet when men refuse to be reasoned out of a false theory they deserve to be laughed out of a false countenance.

The reader will please be so kind as to join the writer in his earnest effort to keep the point under discussion fairly and fully

in view. The effort is to fall into line and follow those heroic and immortal pathfinders who in the early pages of this REVIEW blazed the way through the bewildering desert of false religious notions to something like an approximately proper conception of the Church in its historic character. It was their claim that the wisdom of the present should so study the instructive lessons of the past, and deepen its reverence for the records and achievements thereof, as to quicken its steps for legitimate progress in the great hereafter. The contention is not for old things because of their age or venerable antiquity, but because the recognition of the historic past is necessary to establish the legitimacy of the present. Besides, reverence for the old and the past is preparatory to the proper anticipation of the new and the future. Dr. Bomberger was never suspected of making too much account of Christian antiquity, and yet it was one of his felicitous expressions and happy hits that "old bread is better than fresh foam." He knew very well that old bread is not necessarily stale and moldy. It becomes such only when taken out of God's pantry, and out of all concrete relation to the ever fresh and refreshing stream of living and historic Christianity. This stream may have its meanderings, and at times flow sluggishly through marshy lowlands, but it is still the stream that maketh glad the City of God. Along its channel God writes the history of the Church. It is conceded that God sometimes writes upon a crooked line, and sometimes with a spluttering human pen, yet he never uses anything but indellible ink, neither does he apply to his own work an absolutely destructive blotter.

Any other view of God's kingdom and power and glory as an economy of grace in the world for human salvation seems contrary to all the teachings of the past. From Moses to Christ, from the Patriarchal to the Apostolic age, not one jot or title of the law of succession and continuity in historic development has ever passed away. When the Divine Architect designs and makes all things new He does not necessarily make new things. Old things pass away by pouring their essential substance into the mold of a higher form. Thus each section of one grand organic

whole prepares the way for and prophesies the coming of its successor. Mosaism had its roots in an earlier age and, as Van Osterzee says, "is the continuation of a golden thread whose beginning is in the Divine promise of hoary antiquity." Prophetism, while it is the continuation and fulfillment of Mosaism, leads by preparatory steps to the establishment of the theocracy, and this again moves forward in the process of dissolving its own form of the O. T. economy and the fulfillment of its typical contents in a better form of the same thing. And although Judaism in its last stage showed a deplorable condition of degeneracy rather than a normal unfolding of what it at first possessed, it was still the custodian of the promised seed, and in that form the historical channel and organ of its development in and for the world, until the Christ of history, by the act of His incarnation, stepped upon the historic stage as the realization of all previous history and the fountain source of all that was necessary for its future onflow to its eschatological completion. The Incarnation is, therefore, to be viewed as the blooming of the flower and the bearing of a fruit whose process of production was going on before the fullness of time. This it was, but it was also the introduction into history of a new principle of life in the person of the historic Christ. His birth was, therefore, not strictly the beginning of Church history, but its commencement under the Christian form. There was, therefore, no break in the line of historic continuity at the stable door in Bethlehem, neither was there any real discontinuation of old historic forces on the day of Pentecost. The latter was, indeed, the birthday of the Christian Church, even as Protestantism was born in the morning of the Reformation, but there was no birth in either case without its proper previous period of historic gestation. Protestantism is, therefore, just as really in the line of Church history as any other form of Christianity, and the latter is no less historic than the human race. A sudden termination of the history of either one would be just about as reasonably supposable as a sudden break in continuity of either of the other two. In no case can one jot or tittle of this law of continuity pass away until all be fulfilled.

But how and in what form is all this to be fulfilled? To narrow the question down to more manageable limitations, what form is Protestantism to assume as it comes to a more clear apprehension of itself in the line of historic succession and in the final solution of the problem of historical development. Of course, any attempt at a satisfactory solution of this interesting question would carry us over into the field of speculative philosophy and theology. Such speculation to command the respect of those who have a true conception of Church history dare not confine itself to the narrow noble sphere of Protestantism alone. The field of such inquiry must have a broader range. The last 400 years have furnished no conclusive evidence that the Roman Catholic and less desirable form of Christianity is to step entirely from the stage before the curtain is lifted upon the final solution of this interesting problem. This seems reasonable, however much our speculation may deplore its inability to bring Romanism and Protestantism into a mutual completion of themselves in something better than either and greater than both. The readers of the old *Mercersburg Review* have not forgotten that this interesting question was approached by the giants of the Reformed Church nearly a half century ago. Their tentative position, to say the least, was very beautiful, especially as touched up by the ornate pen of Dr. Schaff in his excellent essay on *German Theology and the Church Question*. He expresses his admiration for the projected speculative theory and does not consider it necessarily out of harmony with modern exegetical investigation; that as Jewish Christianity, represented by Peter, and Gentile Christianity, represented by Paul, come to their higher union in the spirit of John, so would the Christian Judaism of the New Testament, as represented by the Romish Church, and Protestant Christianity, finally meet in a festival of reconciliation and mutual completion in the Johannean age of Church history, and all be glorified together in the last stage of its development.

So much in the way of speculation as indulged in by Rothe, Thiersch, Neander and Mohler and as reproduced with comments

more or less favorable by Schaff, Nevin and Higbee. Such reasonings of the Church's future history may not lead to correct conclusions, and yet good speculation is better than unsound historic theology. The question of importance is not what form the history of the Church may assume in the future and in what beautiful garments the Redeemer's bride may be attired when, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, she steps forth fully adorned for her final meeting with the returning Bridegroom. The question is: How can she best remove her spots and wrinkles? We can think of nothing more conducive to such beautification than conservative progress. Such wrinkles cannot be removed by the application of any amount of humanitarian cosmetics. The cause of the spot malady does not lie entirely upon the surface of the patient, and the cure can be effected only by internal remedy and consequent normal development. Growth removes wrinkles. Dr. Schaff says that true Church growth is both internal and external. Let Zion press out the folds of her shriveled epidermis by more and better internal growth. Like her divine head, the Church must increase in wisdom and in stature. An increase in wisdom must lead her to a consciousness of herself, her constitution and the continuity of her history to the end of the world. Such historic continuity is inseparable from her unity and essential to her catholicity. The most ecumenical confession of Protestantism teaches concerning the Holy Catholic Church "that out of the whole human race, *from the beginning to the end of the world*, the Son of God, by His Spirit and word gathers, defends and preserves for Himself, unto everlasting life, a chosen communion, *in the unity of the true faith*." Such unity does not necessarily imply sameness of theological opinion. Paul withheld Peter; Cyprian of Carthage differed from Stephen of Rome; one Pope anathematized another; Zwingli and Luther reached only a one-sided agreement at Marburg. If, then, there has always been room for a certain or uncertain latitude of views in the Holy Catholic Church, it certainly ought to be more generally admitted and emphasized that there is not only room, but also reason, for a greater accentuation in agreement as to

what this "Chosen Communion" is in her objective and concrete constitution. The case calls for growth as well as purity in the inward parts. This is necessary in order to a presentation of herself without spot or wrinkle. The King's daughter must be made more conscious of the fact that in her ideal she is all glorious within before the King can admire the superlative charms of her more external comeliness. In the Church, as in the State, zeal for territorial extension and imperial expansion should never be so unduly exercised and unproportionately applied as to result in a virtual neglect of that equally important internal growth which is absolutely essential to an indispensable Church consciousness. It is the duty of the Church to lengthen her lines, but only in the proportion that she strengthens her stakes—her old stakes, and a knowledge of her old historic way marks, instead of driving so many new stakes in the sand.

The alarming fact now at work in, and to be deplored by, our earnest Protestantism is either ignorance of or opposition to the true idea of Christianity as a concrete historic force in the world under the form and in the mystery of the Holy Catholic Church as an object of faith. Men mouth that article of the Creed without any proper conception as to what the mystery involves and requires, and then profess to imagine that they hear the symphonies of heaven in the babal sounds of the devil's sectarian hornpipes. Moving within a circular syllogism of great religiousness, and in the dubious light of natural reason and almost unnatural sentimentality, they have no conception of Christianity except as it is supposed to hold in sentiment, theory, opinion or doctrine, abstractly considered and extractly taken directly from the Bible. In this way religious infidelity, baptized in the name of modern evangelisticism and other mocking birds of the same feather, builds its church nest out of sectarian corncobs, lays its eggs with a felicitous cackle, and incubates its miserable broods in a manner and to an extent sufficiently alarming to try the patience of the saints.

Of course, this paper is not written with the presumptuous purpose of bringing forth anything new upon the subject dis-

cussed. The first few volumes of this REVIEW are in evidence that the question needs no reopening. To do so would be an attempt to thresh over old straw which has already yielded its full measure of excellent grain. It is rather the duty of the hour for the Reformed Church to keep fresh in her mind the lessons taught in that memorable discussion of nearly fifty years ago. Indeed, this REVIEW seems to have been started in large part for the very special purpose of bringing out, as it actually did in bold and beautiful relief, the soundness of the principle contended for in those immortal papers on Cyprian and Early Christianity. Those articles and the principle advocated therein will live until the gates of hell prevail against the One, Apostolic, Holy Catholic, Reformed Church. Such a catastrophe, however, is not conceivable to those who have faith in the Church as a divine-human and historic mystery in the world. They see the guarantee of her triumph in her essential nature, as well as in the promise of her already triumphant Head. And yet they are not indifferent as witnesses of her struggles toward the glorious consummation of her history. Her wide-awake watchmen are even now standing on the tip-toe of anxiety in their efforts to discern the signs of the times. It seems, however, that the most earnest struggles of this present time, in which men are so intently engaged in their efforts to solve the practical problems of Christianity, are not worthy to be compared with the glory of that earnest inquiry which characterized the Reformed Church during the middle of the century which is now passing away with the remaining few who witnessed the war of the giants fifty years ago.

The energies of the Church are not wasted by a consistent persistence in the investigation of those questions which pertain to her nature and mission in the world. In fact, those energies can be used for the more practical purpose of the gospel only in the proportion that they are applied in a manner logically agreeable to the principles of philosophy that underlie the whole grand system and movement of human redemption from the closing of the garden gates of Eden to the opening of the pearly portals. Of the 1,029 ministers of the Reformed Church in the United

States 985 have come upon the watch-tower since the close of that memorable controversy, yet the records are open to all that may wish to inform themselves of its nature and conclusions. According to the judgment of the writer, the following may be regarded as among the facts made clear and distinctly manifest in the first two volumes of the old *Mercersburg Review*:

1. The Church is a supernatural constitution of life and power in the world whose essential attributes are unity, holiness and catholicity.
2. The Church in her nature and mission is also essentially historic, extending with unbroken continuity from the beginning to the end of the world, or parallel in time with the full evolution of the human race.
3. The unity of the Church flows not simply from the *appointment* of Christ, but from his *nature*, a denial of which fact is equivalent to a denial of the proper mystery of the Incarnation, and by a parity of false reasoning would lead to the denial of the federal headship of the first Adam.
4. It is presumptuous for the Romish part to claim to be the whole Catholic Church and the sole custodian and dispenser of heavenly gifts.
5. The evils of the Romish system are admitted, exposed and deplored as abominations of desolation standing in the holy place; yet they can never be removed by puckering and pouting the pitiful lips of pitiful piety at the Pope.
6. The Reformation is neither a deformation, as charged by the hierarchy of the Romish Church, nor a new creation directly from the Bible, as claimed by Puritanic theorists and sects, but a cardinal fact in Church history, and must be viewed and defended as introducing a *new phase* of Christianity, and an advance upon the earlier periods of its progressive development in the world.
7. We should not allow ourselves, as Protestants, to be placed in an attitude of mere defense as over against the Romish Church. And in the advocacy of our claims to a legitimate birth and positive character we should frankly acknowledge that

Catholicism, with all its errors and corruptions, was the bearer of medieval Christianity and the necessary preparation for Protestantism itself. The honor of Protestantism is not jeopardized thereby any more than the glory of the New Testament is diminished by giving the Old Testament full credit as a preparatory dispensation of the Gospel.

8. The proper idea of the Church as a historic constitution of supernatural power in the world involves a corresponding view of the Holy Sacraments. These signs and seals of invisible grace, like the Episcopacy, can never be regarded in their true character except as they are viewed in their vital relation to the Church which is always the ground and pillar of their truth. An organ is nothing outside of its organism. Anglican Episcopacy and unsacramentalist sects are more fortunate in their religion than they are logical in the shallow reasonings of their circular syllogisms. Unchurchly Christianity derives benefit from the Church as a life-bearing constitution in the world just in the proportion, but not for the reason, that its unhistoric views are unsound. Apostolic succession and sacramental grace may be beneficial even to those who are blind to the objective mystery in which they stand and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God. Clear views and logical reasonings essential to a sound historic theology may not be necessary to a saving faith. A child may derive nourishment by drinking milk which it supposes is taken from the town pump. Such admission does not need to make room for the miserable scarecrow of an *opus operatum* sometimes "set to frighten fools away," or to terrify the true and legitimate children of the bride-chamber. The Sacraments do not work in and of themselves. Neither does the Episcopacy work in virtue of anything that it may claim to have fontally in itself, but because of its relation to the ground and pillar in which it rests, even though the historic continuity of that ground and pillar be virtually denied, as it pretentiously proceeds in its silly efforts to discover itself and its ecclesiastical pedigree beyond the missing links of 1,400 years.

9. A distinction without separation between the word of God and the Bible—the former as forever settled in the heavens,

and whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting, and the latter as classified with other divine-human elements and agencies under the proper purview and scope of sacred history. So also the relation between the Church and the Gospel admits of distinction without conceding a dualism. The New Testament scriptures grew out of this living relation. They can never be safely and beneficially used except in believing submission to the authority of the Holy Catholic Church, as exercised in accordance with the provisions of her heavenly charter. Outside of this holy communion no scripture is of private interpretation. Private judgment as a sacred right beneficially exercised in matters of religion must be defined, defended and qualified in those who are free children of the free Jerusalem, which is the mother of all who are very members incorporate of Christ's body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all; and he who does not believe in, and neglects to hear the maternal voice of, the Holy Catholic Church is to be regarded as a heathen man and publican. They have no right to appeal to the Bible. It has to do with an economy to which outsiders are strangers. It is not lawful to cast the children's bread to the dogs. Dogs may incline to be gregarious, but they are outside of history and can have no part with the children. They have nothing to conserve, and their nature is not capable of progress. They may bark at the moon, but they have no power to admire her lunar loveliness as she moves on in her nocturnal mission, heralding the more superlative glory of the coming day.

## IV.

### VICARIOUS SUFFERING THE ORDER OF NATURE.

BY PROF. JACOB COOPER, D.D., D.C.L.

Bishop Butler is the first writer who has given prominence to Analogy as the basis of Reasoning. In its application, however, he limits it to the relations between the present life as a fact which is open to experience and that declared in the revealed will of God. It is true that Origen stated the principle of this Analogy, and his statement is made the basis of Butler's argument. But though asserted so long ago it never entered largely into apologetics until Butler's celebrated work, which has become the type of those arguments since employed for the rational defense of revealed religion.

The author of the "Analogy" exercised the prophetic office because he breathed the atmosphere of the truth he was commissioned to proclaim. The true seer looks below the surface and grasps the roots of things, and, therefore, his message has unlimited application. It is doubtful whether Origen, or even Butler, saw the wide reach of Analogy, which is in truth the only legitimate method for the investigation and interpretation of that which is yet unknown. For knowledge must grow by a comparison between that which is seen and known and that which we are seeking. The true prophet does not always comprehend the full significance of his own message; neither does the age to which he speaks. But when the fullness of time comes, when men are able to receive the truth, the real meaning is read into the words which before were an enigma. Butler's time has come, and he has found a fit interpreter in Mr. Gladstone.\* For, from the grasp of his intellect, the extent of his culture, and

\*The Works of Joseph Butler, D.C.L. Edited by the Right Honorable William E. Gladstone. 3 vols. The Macmillan Company, New York and London, 1896.

the moral earnestness of his character, he is the best fitted of all men to wear the mantle which the prophet dropped. The sympathy which he feels for the author whose work he edits may be understood by the assertion that he has made Butler's method the guiding principle of his life. In the notes on his Works, and in his "Subsidiary Studies," he shows a grasp of the subject and a subtlety of reasoning equal to Butler himself.

Much as the arguments of Bishop Butler in proof of the scriptural system are admired, and exhaustive as they appear in their combined effect, there is one phase of Analogy which he did not develop to the extent its importance demands. This is the subject of *Vicarious Suffering*, which is the chief corner stone of the Gospel scheme and indispensable to the doctrine of forgiveness and justification. For assuredly there is as striking analogy between the course of nature disclosed in human experience and that revealed in the Holy Scriptures on this subject as in any of the other numerous points which Butler so ably discusses. Nor has this analogy ever been developed with that thoroughness accorded to other aspects of truth, though the materials for its discussion are inexhaustible. Yet the doctrine of atonement is not only accepted by the Christian as the cardinal principle of his faith and hope, but it is the especial point of attack made by all opponents. The believer in the vicarious suffering of a Redeemer contends that this gives significance to the whole system of religion, whether found in the Old or New Testament. Herein the Christian and the Jew agree as to the principle, though they may differ in regard to the person who should fulfill the types and shadows of the temple service, as well as to the meaning of the plain declarations of prophets and apostles. Unbelievers are equally agreed in their opposition to this doctrine. The Cross is emphatically the scandal to the Jew and foolishness to the Greek who read both Law and Gospel with a veil over their faces. It would seem that every species of argument and ridicule which hostility could devise has been hurled against the doctrine that the innocent should be compelled, or even permitted, to suffer in the room of the guilty. Opponents say that it is contrary to every principle of

law and justice, whether in code or unwritten usage. They maintain that it makes God a tyrant in that He departs from justice in two ways. For on this theory the transgressor escapes the penalty due to his offenses and the innocent is punished for what he has not done. Nor does it make much difference in the scales of justice, it is asserted, whether the victim of this punishment undergoes it voluntarily or not. For according to strict equity none who are guilty should be allowed to escape, and surely no innocent person should be punished. But this reverses the whole trend of positive law among men, and also is subversive of the eternal principles of morality which must prevail in any wise and wholesome government.

In answer to this contention we apply the analogy of nature. We are compelled to take things as they are unless we can reverse the system under which we live—an undertaking that few even of agnostics will have the hardihood to attempt. No *a priori* theories founded upon our notions of justice can change the order of procedure observed in the natural government of the world. We must, therefore, adjust our views to the facts as we find them, since our theories have no more effect in staying the course of moral law than our ignorance of astronomy has in nullifying the Copernican system. And, therefore, the line of argument which Butler employs, both in the Sermons and the Analogy, is to show the similarity of the Revealed System to the order of nature to which we find ourselves subject. Now, it is maintained, without fear of successful opposition, that the whole order of nature, both material and spiritual, is, as far as we can trace it, pervaded by the principle of Vicarious Suffering. It is true that all such suffering does not involve either innocence or guilt. But in the higher and more special forms of voluntary suffering the prevalence of substitution and transference of guilt is manifest.

To begin with that kind where there is no guilt and consequently no punishment to be met or atoned. Birth in every species of viviparous animals is effected by vicarious suffering. Even in normal parturition, which is doubtless as acute pain

as can be endured without causing death, the mother suffers in order to render the continuance of life possible. The burdens of pregnancy, the dangers—not merely to the lower animals, but to the human species—which it increases, are a suffering in advance. The throes of childbirth under the most favored conditions, and the train of diseases which follow as attendant circumstances, are only, as it were, the beginning of the vicarious suffering of the parent for the child. Among the lower animals, whether viviparous or oviparous, the helpless young become at once an undesirable charge on the patience, labor and courage of the parent. The mother bird or animal will adventure her life for the protection of her young, and often pays this forfeit. This fact, in all the extent of its significance, is employed by the embodiment of this principle as the true type (Matt. XIII: 37) of His own experience, and by this application shows that all parts of the moral government of the earth are coördinates of this method.

With man the continuance of the care for the young is for a longer time because the relationship is not forgotten and the need of supervision is still evident. Nay, the anxiety rather increases as the life of the child advances, and often is intensified because of the moral dangers to which, by its inexperience, it is threatened.\* Hence the burden is not chiefly in caring for the helplessness of infancy or watching over the sick child, where the devotion of the mother is not measured by her strength but her life. It is not the labor and care in the education of offspring wherein every energy of body and faculty of the spirit are taxed to the utmost to provide for their future success and comfort. But it is shown still more in the agony of fear lest they go astray morally, and in the shame when they have disgraced themselves. Rachel mourns for her children and refuses to be comforted because they are not, and she wails still more piteously when they are lost to virtue. No matter whether it be the Jewess Rizpah, who watches the the wasting bodies of her children who were slaughtered because state reasons demanded their unoffending

\* Well expressed by the German Proverb: Kleine Kinder Kleine Sorgen; Grosse Kinder Grosse Sorgen.

lives, or an English Rizpah, who gazed in sleepless vigils on her son who hung upon the gallows tree for his own misdeeds.\* The greater the offenses of our children the more deep the shame they have brought upon themselves by their vileness, the more clearly do we understand the wail of David : "Would to God I had died for thee, my son ! my son !" If, then, God is a Father as He is distinctly revealed to us in the Gospel plan, if He has a degree of pity for His children proportional to the infinitude of His nature, which is declared to be love, then the analogy bears us out in the contention that the vicarious suffering of the parent for the child has its counterpart in the Divine plan to secure man's redemption. And, indeed, the willingness of the parent himself to receive the blow due to the iniquities of his progeny knows no limit. For we feel sure that any devoted parent will admit that, if it were possible for another to suffer the penalties deserved by the damned, then would such parent endure everlasting punishment, undeserved, to screen his offspring from that which it merited !

The same principle of vicarious punishment is seen in the reverse order from that of the parent suffering for the child. For the offspring undoubtedly inherits not only the physical and mental constitution of the parent, but, to a greater degree, the moral character. Diseases are inherited. Tendencies toward certain maladies are acknowledged by medical science, and are made the basis for the calculation of longevity by life assurance. Predisposition to action in certain directions crops out both in the immediate successors and in those far removed. This depends, no doubt, in part on education and material surroundings. But these again are in great part the direct result of the moral and physical character of the parent. The children of thieves are born in the atmosphere of theft. They breathe in its pollution ; they listen to its language ; they instinctively learn its ways ; and so, from generation to generation, we have the same criminal classes. While they tax the vigilance of the police and prey upon society, yet the children of such parents suffer the greatest punishment which can be inflicted in this world by being endowed with an almost uncontrollable proneness to go to destruction !

\* Vide Tennyson's "Rizpah."

Moreover, character finds its level, its chosen companionship, and in them its tendency to further development along the same lines. In this way the child, wholly without responsibility of its own, inherits a bodily and moral constitution which implant in it from birth the seeds of pain and sin. These rooting themselves in the proper soil of their surroundings, for which during the early and formative period the victims are entirely irresponsible, both cause suffering and insure its continuance. They certainly do not at this period suffer because of offences of their own. For the majority of such children pay the extreme penalty before arriving at years of conscious action. And those who survive are so unfavorably situated that it is miraculous if they are not forcibly dragged down by their tendencies and surroundings to a life of misery, to a premature death, and grave of shame. This is one of the most painful thoughts connected with human destiny on earth. It would be insupportable, even in contemplation, if we did not hope for another life wherein some rectification is possible for those who never consciously transgressed in this and yet suffered for the sins of others ; an existence when Divine compassion will mete out both justice and mercy to those who had so little encouragement here to walk in a path of virtue. But this distribution of justice is not the matter under consideration at this time. It may be safely left to the Judge of all the earth, who will assuredly do right ; who will distribute the stripes according to the knowledge or ignorance of the offender. Our object is to show that the scheme of law under which we live is one of vicarious suffering ; that this is clearly discerned in the coördinate experiences of parents and children which may be considered as a type of all that is common to human nature, and that this principle is exemplified in every phase of civilized life.

There are only a few, comparatively, of the world's population who really earn their bread. The majority are leeches on the body politic. They consume but do not produce. They are cumberers of the ground ; bearing no fruit themselves and in the way of the strenuous and thrifty. Most cases of poverty and helplessness are occasioned by the negligence or positive wrong-

doing of those whom the industrious and virtuous are compelled to support in retreats and houses of correction. The order of the world, both in civilized and savage life, is that a few, and often those who are weaker, work for the strong who are either vicious or thriftless, while the moral law declares plainly that he who will not work shall not eat. Yet this states what ought to be, not what actually is, the case. Hence this looks forward to a state which is not attained, and in this respect is exactly parallel to that consummation in another life to which the Revealed system points. A state of discipline involves imperfection in all that are subject to it, and can only show a tendency toward a more perfect condition. In like manner, all taxes for the support of the vicious and thriftless display an unmistakable phase of vicarious suffering and one which is inseparable from any plan of organized society, whether in a single community or the entire state. And the more complete the form of government be, the more carefully will it provide for all who, through their own vices or those of heredity, have become incapable of caring for themselves. If it be said that this is an involuntary obligation, forced upon us by the exigencies of society, the proof does not thereby become any weaker. For it shows a course of things to which we must submit for the reason that we are members of a community which is subject to a fixed ordinance, and this embraces as much of the scheme of government *de facto* under which we find ourselves placed as we are able to comprehend. There is every reason to believe that this scheme extends farther than we can now see. In no case are we justified in concluding that the ordinances of nature stop exactly at the point where our powers become too weak to follow them. For in scientific research it has always been found that a general tendency, which undoubtedly prevails as far as investigations up to a given period had enabled men to see, continue to be valid as farther progress was made. This principle is absolutely necessary to all inductive science. For if there were not uniformity in nature there could be no science, since it is alike indispensable for the discovery and classification of facts.

We see the fact of vicarious suffering in the usages of society in every stage; but more clearly, because better defined, in the most advanced culture. The system of suretyship has always existed since history began among men. One person is permitted to take the place of another in assuming his obligations. He becomes responsible for the satisfaction of the creditor; and if the principal does not meet his stipulation the law recognizes as equity in this case the amount which has been secured, and exacts of the surety with as much rigor as though he were the one who has value received. This is a necessity of business as soon as it has advanced beyond the stages of barter and immediate payment. The complicated relations of trade and commerce cannot be conducted without credit, and the faith of a promise which rests upon two or more assurances of payment becomes as trustworthy as the faith of that number of witnesses before a court of justice to establish a matter of fact. Yet for the surety there is 'no value received. The act is purely voluntary on his part. He undertakes to assure the payment of a sum that the principal does not at the time possess, or of which the creditor has not satisfactory evidence. When, therefore, the principal in the transaction either proves unable to make good his promise of payment, or through fraud evades it, the surety suffers through the inability or dishonesty of him whom he has befriended. The only facts which the law deems it necessary to establish are that the suretyship was voluntarily assumed, and that no fraud was intended by the principal. This usage is universal in business, and is likely to remain so unless all men become equal in property, in honesty or in credit on 'change, all of which conditions are as impossible as the equality of talents for business and energy in its promotion.

And yet there is perhaps no other usage in business which wrecks more fortunes and entails more trouble and suffering upon the thrifty and obliging than suretyship. The innocent benefactor suffers for that of which he is in no sense the author. For he is not the cause of the failure from which he is compelled to suffer, but rather of its prevention as far as possible; and finally,

when there is no other means of satisfying justice, bears the penalty.

Other forms of vicarious suffering might be noticed. For this principle not only ramifies all the relations of men, but it is the type of law which pervades all sentient nature. It is enough, however, to show its prevalence in leading directions of human action, such as finance, the administration of law, the social relations of men in the family and state, in the physical and moral constitution of the human race. For these embrace practically all that concerns us as inhabitants of this world, and as undergoing discipline preliminary to another. Hence it is absurd to say that vicarious suffering cannot be admitted in the government of God. For it actually is here, and does occupy the most prominent place of all principles known. It is as indispensable for understanding the governmental system in dealing with sentient nature as causation is in material things. The scheme of Redemption and Atonement for sin by one who is able to suffer its penalty is not, then, contrary to reason and abhorrent to justice, as the enemies of the Gospel so flippantly assert. On the contrary, here, as shown in so many lines of human experience, this is found to be in strict conformity with the conditions under which man is actually placed. And let it be distinctly understood that we are dealing with vicarious suffering not as an *a priori* principle of law. For we have to reckon not with an utopian form of moral government, but with the facts of man's destiny just as we encounter them. For the analogy we are seeking is between the constitution and course of nature as revealed in actual experience and that announced by what professes itself to be a direct revelation from God in the written Word. If, moreover, the two realms of Nature, that of this life and that beyond to which the present seems to be introductory, are by the same Author we should expect to find the principles of their polity similar as far as we could trace them. The two sections seem to be coördinates of the same higher unity, and by their similarity conversely argue a common origin. The revealed word declares, by a series of prophetic statements which grow clearer continually

as time advances, that a deliverer shall come to take away sin by enduring its penalty. Finally, it is authoritatively announced by one who asserts that he is himself the embodiment of the truth and the fulfillment of all the utterances of prophecy. This the Messiah, who had so often been predicted, asserts in the clearest language that he has in the fullness of time come into the world in order to deliver it from the consequences of sin by assuming as a surety the responsibility and meeting the penalty. This suretyship was voluntary, and tendered by One who had both the ability and the right to assume the debt of man's default and secure its payment. For the surety in every instance, whether for debt, or for bail in case of misdemeanor, must have sufficient means to make good the delinquency, or present in person a substitute for the offender when he has disappeared. The person who thus fulfills all the relations of the surety can meet all its conditions, and do this without being destroyed himself. He thus illustrates the whole system of government, whether physical or moral, and so makes the analogy complete. How marvellous it may be that the guilty can escape punishment by the sufferings of the innocent, that those who have made themselves wretched by their own conduct can be restored through the intervention of one who has committed no offence; still we find that such is the order of that system according to which we are now living.

The transference of guilt from the offender, and of righteousness from the surety, are declared by the enemies of the Gospel scheme to be both impossible and absurd. But we see power in the natural world transferred. One ball strikes another and imparts all its energy to the second, while the first remains still. All the power employed in machinery is transferred. Motion is generated by the destruction of one material, and the potential energy is changed into the actual, which works through a new body or medium. In the great majority of cases where energy is transferred it seems to be taken from an inexhaustible supply. The heat of the sun, the force of gravity, the energy of electricity, are utilized by the transference of a part, so that it comes under man's control. He would be helpless unless these agents and

other kindred were in the plan of nature given to him. This poverty in himself is made rich by the unlimited riches found in Nature's treasury, which can give out without being replenished, and yet never become exhausted. This is in strict analogy with the scheme of vicarious suffering. Man lies helpless, sold under sin. He cannot atone for his offences without destruction. Power must be transferred to him from a source which is sufficient to compensate for his lack, and to endure the loss—however much has gone out—without the destruction of that which yields the supply. We can as easily understand the transference of energy from one moral agent to another as in the case of material things. We have constant evidence of the latter because all the acts of life, as well as the laws of physical science, are dependent upon such transference. In the latter case no one disputes the facts. They are seen wherever force is either generated or applied, and these data include all our experience with material nature. In the former the statements of Divine Revelation are explicit that man is utterly helpless to overcome the power of a sinful nature, and can be made capable of holy living in no other way than by taking away his own sin, and by the imputation of righteousness which belongs to another. If the method of Divine government through vicarious atonement is absurd so also is the course of nature. Transference of energy, by which a creature helpless in himself can control the physical powers of the world to an indefinable extent, is the measure of a progressive civilization. Transference of righteousness, that is imputation of the Divine holiness, after the offender's guilt has been assumed and his debt to justice paid, not only renders him guiltless before the bar of God, but also makes him a growing factor in the creation of a new heaven and a new earth by alliance with that energy whereby Jesus Christ is able to subdue all things unto Himself.

V.

## LIMITATIONS OF THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD.

BY PROFESSOR EML. V. GERHART, D.D.

The scientific method of research is the application of induction to the investigation of any realm of existences, whether natural or supernatural, whether personal or impersonal. If a process of investigation be legitimately conducted, according to the laws of thought governing induction, the trustworthiness of the result depends primarily, not on the logical order of the process, but on the validity of the *principle* underlying and sustaining the inductive process. This principle is an *a priori* idea. Thought assumes it, and assumes it spontaneously. By no method of argument can the governing idea be proven. The inductive principle conditions the validity of reasoning from particulars to a general truth, just as in the opposite method the deductive principle conditions the validity of reasoning from a general proposition to the truth of a particular.

The inductive process and the law by which it is governed are variously stated by different logicians, but regarding the essential features of legitimate induction all are in accord. According to J. Stuart Mill, "induction is the process by which we conclude that what is true of certain individuals of a class is true of the whole class, or that what is true at certain times will be true under similar circumstances at all times."\* The first clause expresses the principal idea as to the nature of inductive thought. From two or more known particulars of a given class thought infers what the whole class is, though otherwise unknown. The doctrine of induction as taught by Sir William Hamilton agrees with Mill's representation. "There is a process of reasoning," says Hamilton, "from the parts to the whole, as well as from the

\* System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive, by John Stuart Mill, p. 174.

whole to the parts." \* Each process, the inductive and the deductive, is governed by its own laws, one as necessary and independent as the other. The law by which the inductive syllogism is governed, as Hamilton expresses it, is that "what belongs, or does not belong, to all the constituent parts, belongs or does not belong to the constituted whole." He adds that to conclude of the whole what is not conceived as a predicate of all its constituent parts violates the law of the inductive syllogism, and the supposed legitimate inference is a fallacy. The law which governs the deductive syllogism is directly the opposite; the predicate of the whole is the predicate of all the parts, or what is conceived to be true of a class is true of all the individuals of that class.

Mill represents inductive thought as the process from "certain individuals of a class" to the whole of that class, the principle being that what is true of *some*, or of two or more individuals, is true of all. The inference amounts, not to certain knowledge, but to a probability, and the probability gains the force of truth in the degree that the number of known individuals of the same genus increases and diminishes in force as the number of known individuals is less.

According to both Mill and Hamilton, inductive reasoning passes from the parts to the whole; but as Hamilton represents the process he differs from Mill as to the principle which the process assumes. Mill passes from *some* parts to a knowledge of all; whilst Hamilton passes from *all* the parts to the whole. The difference, if consistently held, is great. As represented by Mill inductive reasoning infers a universal truth from two or more individuals; as represented by Hamilton inductive reasoning infers a universal truth from all the individuals. If we know all the constituent parts, especially if we know them in their reciprocal relations, we presumably have certain knowledge of the whole class. But in most cases, if we know only some parts, or some individuals of a class, we cannot infer that we have certain knowledge of the whole; for the parts unknown may have

\* Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic, p. 227.

qualities or relations which, if known, would reverse or modify our judgment of the whole.

The doctrine as propounded by Hamilton, though the only adequate statement of inductive logic, can scarcely be enforced in the investigations pursued by natural science, or in any other department of scientific inquiry. It may be safely said that in nearly every department of nature, perhaps in all departments, though the investigations be accurate and extensive, though the largest number of facts be collated and classified, we fall short of the discovery and knowledge of *all* the individuals of a class, or *all* the phenomena of a supposed law; and so long as we do not know all phenomena or all the individuals of a class we cannot logically infer that our knowledge covers the class as a whole or all the essential properties of the class.

In support of the foregoing observations on the availability of an adequate doctrine of induction as propounded by Hamilton for scientific purposes, I cite the criticism of William Thomson, D.D.:

"Our confidence in the uniformity of natural laws is embodied in the canon that *under the same circumstances and with the same substances the same effects always result from the same causes*. This great inductive principle is itself proved by induction, and partakes of the same formal defect that may be charged against other inductive results, namely, that its terms are wider than our experience can warrant. Many groups of facts, connected as causes and effects, have not been examined; and in them it is conceivable at least that there may be capricious causes producing opposite effects at different times. \* \* \* We draw a universal canon from an experience less than universal, and then employ it to justify us in drawing other universal truths from other particular experiences." \*

The universal proposition drawn from an experience of facts necessarily limited proceeds on the assumption that the unknown properties of a given species or a given genus are identical with

\* Outline of the Laws of Thought by William Thomson, D.D., Professor of the Queen's College, Oxford, p. 273.

the known properties. The assumption is a metaphysical postulate, demanded not by facts or phenomena, but by the spontaneous impulses of reason.

Turning to Whateley we meet the same general conception. "Induction," he asserts, "is some kind of argument which infers, respecting a whole class, what has been ascertained respecting one or more individuals of that class."<sup>\*</sup> This lucid statement he illustrates: "When, from having always observed a certain sheep ruminating, we infer that this individual sheep will continue to ruminate we assume that the property which has hitherto belonged to this sheep will remain unchanged. When we infer the same property of all sheep we assume that the property which belongs to this individual belongs to the whole species. \* \* \*

"These are merely different forms of the maxim that nature is uniform in her operations the application of which admits of every degree of evidence from perfect moral certainty to mere conjecture."<sup>†</sup>

Governed in our conception of the scientific method by these and other eminent logicians, men who occupy a position of authority in the department of logic, I am warranted in laying down several propositions which have fundamental force.

1. From one or more known particulars, whether viewed as individuals, or facts, or phenomena, induction infers the otherwise unknown particulars. Thought passes from the knowledge of some parts to an idea of the whole, or to an idea of the law of the whole, and thus to a conception of all the constituent parts.

2. The inference from known facts is drawn to the *whole of the class* to which the known facts belong. From the peculiar habits of two or more sheep, to use Whateley's illustration, we may infer the peculiar habits, not of swine, but only of all sheep. The inference is rigidly limited to the species or genus in which the known individuals stand. An inference from the known to the unknown if both do not belong to the same class, or species, or genus, is illogical and fallacious.

\* Whateley's Elements of Logic, p. 439.

† Ibid., p. 287.

3. This method of reasoning which infers the truth of a universal proposition from a proposition of limited import is based on the canon quoted above from Thomson, that under the same circumstances and with the same substances the same effects always result from the same causes—a great principle, an *a priori* idea, which cannot be demonstrated, but is itself supported by induction.

The principal law of induction which I propose chiefly to emphasize is that in every valid inference from the singular to the universal, or from the parts to the whole, the facts from which we reason and the universal to which we reason belong to the same class. To be valid the essential predicates of the universal and the essential predicates of the singular must be the same. If the essential predicates of both be not the same the nerve of inference is cut and the result of inductive reasoning is utterly illogical.

The necessity of passing by way of inference from single facts to the universal law of the same class becomes the touchstone of the validity of a given induction. A scientist may observe a number of facts, but may not know the law that governs or explains the facts. Then he does not understand his facts. He sees certain things, but he can not interpret them. Kepler may serve the purpose of an apt illustration. The peculiar motions of the planets were observed by him, but for a great while he could not account for those peculiar motions; as a consequence, he lacked scientific knowledge of his facts. For him the facts were isolated and disconnected. How should he reason from them without a regulative principle? As Whewell remarks, the pearls are there, but they will not hang together till some one provides the string. Kepler was in the dark until from his own store he could supply the principle of connection. How did he ascertain the principle of connection—the “string” by which “the pearls” might “hang together?” In no way but by a series of guesses. Each guess or hypothesis he puts to the test to determine whether it answers to the facts. Mill says: “The experience of all thinkers will, I believe, testify that the process is tentative; that

it consists of a succession of guesses, many being rejected, until one at last occurs fit to be chosen."\* Before hitting upon the conception of an ellipse, Kepler, as we know from himself, tried nineteen other imaginary paths, which, finding them inconsistent with his observations, he was obliged to reject. But every hypothesis was directly connected with and involved the movements of the planets. It did not enter his mind to attempt a leap from the natural into the supernatural world, and put to the test some spiritual hypothesis. He did not allow himself to suppose that some created spirit, good or bad, might be the immediate cause of the observed variations. No hypothesis so irrational tempted him. Nor did he seek a working hypothesis in the domain of animal or human life. His logical mind in the study of *natural* phenomena sought a regulative conception, an explanatory law, in the realm of nature; and as his observed facts were phenomena in the physical heavens, he sought for the key to the solution of the problem nowhere but in that objective realm.

Kepler's observations of the variations in the revolutions of the planets confined him imperatively to some idea predicable of the heavenly bodies. Inductive thought, by virtue of its own laws, limits its inferences absolutely to that department of things, or of ideas, to which the facts or the phenomena pertain. This law of inductive thought I proceed to consider in its application to some questions of grave import that are challenging the attention of our times.

When reason reflects on the phenomena of the natural world, whether phenomena address us from the mineral or vegetable or animal kingdom, the legitimate inference passes to some law operative in the natural world. From our observations of nature as nature we may reason to the constitution of nature. If phenomena of the mineral kingdom are the objects of investigation the inference is limited to the mineral; it does not pass to the plant. From the sphere of things inorganic, a granite block or a diamond, inductive thought does not infer any law other than a law reigning in the sphere of things inorganic. This law of in-

\* Mill's System of Logic, p. 180

ference prevails in rational knowledge as we ascend, step by step, along the entire scale of nature. The phenomena of the plant limit inference to some general conception of the plant; they do not justify an inference concerning the nature of the animal. These propositions are truisms. To know the plant we investigate the plant; to know the animal we investigate the animal.

The animal and the plant are identical in so far as both are organic, or living things. If we study both simply as being each a domain of organized life our facts justify an inference to some universal law characteristic of life, but not a law distinctively characteristic of animal life or plant life, each being a peculiar order of organisms differentiated from the other. No mineralogist reasons from phenomena exclusively mineralogical to a law distinctive of the plant; no botanist reasons from phenomena exclusively vegetal to a law distinctively characteristic of the animal. This general principle governs the legitimate inquiries of naturalists not only into one kingdom of the natural world in contradistinction from other kingdoms, but governs inquiry also into the different genera or species of the same kingdom. The phenomena of a given genus of whatever kingdom justify inferences only concerning that particular genus as contradistinguished from all other genera of the same family.

Now, if it be logical only to infer from particular facts observable in the natural world some universal law operative in the natural world; if we may reason inductively only from the impersonal to the impersonal, not from the impersonal to the personal, then this negative implication commands assent, namely, that from facts characteristic of the animal kingdom thought cannot infer a universal law characteristic of man.

There is in our day no difference of judgment respecting the unity of the physical world. Nature is not a heterogeneous mass, but a system of things. So all believe and maintain. No individual, no class of objects, no kingdom is isolated. Each is connected in its sphere with another; each is modified more or less by an environment, and each at the same time is influential as a modifying factor for some class or for some individual other than itself.

Thought from observation of such facts forms a general conception of sub-human departments of the natural world, a conception which includes two distinct but interactive principles. There is a continuity of existence, of law, of teleological order regnant in the inorganic world, regnant in the spheres of organized life, running from what I may call the lowest unit, whether a cell or an atom, through every kingdom onward to man, embracing his constitution as the apex and consummation of the ever, and everywhere, active process. This is the truth which the modern theory of evolution has been justly emphasizing. Another principle, another law is equally evident. Every individual, every class or family, every kingdom stands for itself, with a type and law of its own, with relations to things below it and things above it characteristic of itself alone. Each kingdom differs in kind from all other kingdoms as really as each is interlinked with and interdependent on all others. Let us reflect on this twofold truth somewhat more closely.

Of the Christian Paul says: "No man liveth unto himself"—a truth which asserts a law of judgment respecting the created universe. No kingdom performs a function for itself alone, nor does any genus nor species, nor any unit, down to a protozoan. Let thought take a stand at any epoch in the history of life, or lower down at any point along the line of inorganic existences, and there in order to form a judgment, even approximately correct, of the "epoch" or "point" thought has to look backward and forward, and recognize the fact, on the one hand, that the "epoch" or "point" conditions processes that rise beyond it, and on the other that it in turn is conditioned on forces that in the economy of the world are antecedent to it. Yet no process, antecedent or consequent, can be normal unless the thing existent at which thought has taken a stand performs a function conformably to the law of its own type. The truth of Paul's assertion that no man liveth to himself implies that a man be a *man*, not a dog nor an ape. If the object to which the name of man is given be not constitutionally human the proposition of Paul has no meaning.

Whilst it is unquestionable that the plant presupposes lower departments of the natural world and conditions both the animal and man, it is just as unquestionable that, to fulfil its vocation in the economy of the world, the plant must be a *plant*, an organism, differing generically on the one side from the mineral and on the other from the animal. It must realize its own type. It must live, grow and produce according to its own law. Then it accomplishes the end of the reciprocal relationship, constituted and perpetuated by God, between itself and lower existences, between itself and higher kingdoms.

These two universal ideas enter into valid scientific reasoning on the constitution of man and his relative position ; the unity of the natural world of which man is a member, and the generic differentiation of kingdoms, each kingdom having a type of being and performing functions peculiar to itself.

Both ideas demand the recognition of inductive thought, the one as imperatively as the other ; both are equally evident to observation, the former being demonstrated by the interdependent connection of the kingdoms of nature, the latter by the study of each in relation to itself alone. Each idea conditions the other. Whether we emphasize the dynamic bond connecting kingdom with kingdom, or emphasize the distinctive peculiarity of any one kingdom in opposition to all others, we cannot logically have either idea if we vacate the other. Should thought vacate the dynamic bond of connection by virtue of which all genera, all families and kingdoms constitute an articulated whole we should have a riotous multitude of things, each independent of all others, each at war with all others. The idea of a physical universe would no longer have rational validity. The interdependence and interaction of manifold parts would cease, and if interaction ceases the parts would themselves no longer be parts, each would vacate its function, and thus also its place and its claim to a place.

On the other hand, should thought vacate or even ignore the distinctive type of any kingdom, whether of the plant, the animal or man, or the distinctive type characteristic of any genus or family, then the idea of a system of things, of an articulated

whole, would logically be vacated. The objective economy of nature, which we name the world, or kosmos, or physical universe, implies differentiated parts, each part having qualities of its own and performing functions of its own, functions performed by no other part. For example, if holding the existing economy of the world as the point of view, thought vacate the plant, the idea of the animal and of man would be fallacious. No plant, no animal. No animal, no man. The internal dynamic relationship of the plant kingdom to the kingdom of the animate world implied by the cosmological representation of the first chapter of Genesis is logical.

It might be assumed that the emphasis put on the truth of these ideas—the unity of the world and the differentiated selfness of every part—would be acknowledged by all thoughtful scientists. Acknowledged it is by many, but not by all. Phenomena of the plant justify an inference relative to the laws of plant life, not to the laws of animal life. Here scientists and logicians agree. Phenomena characteristic of the animal justify an inference to the animal. Here also scientists and logicians agree. But if we proceed a step further, reasoning according to the same general law of induction which all sound thought honors, and affirm that the distinctive phenomena characteristic of the animal justify an inference to the animal only, many scientists demur. From phenomena of the plant they will reason to the plant only; but from animal phenomena they reason, not only to the laws of animal life, but also to the unique constitution of man, assuming in the face of extraordinary generic differentiations that man is an animal. And the term animal is used not only to denote the fact that there is kinship between the animate life of the animal and the animate life of man; that mineral and vegetal substances condition and enter into the material organization of man's body as into the organization of the body of the animal—a truth which no logician nor anthropologist denies—but the term animal is used also to denote that which is properly and characteristically predicable of mankind. Then what is known to be true of the animal is accepted as truth respecting man. Thought infers the

type and law of human life, not from the moral and spiritual facts which distinguish man's personality, but from the phenomena of the ape.

A singular inconsistency of procedure confronts us. The scientific method claims the distinction of conducting investigations, not from the view-point of an *a priori* thesis, but on the basis of facts, facts carefully ascertained and classified; yet when experimentation and thought approach the noblest kingdom in the economy of nature, the scientific method, as applied by the class of thinkers in question, relinquishes the law of induction and proceeds on the ground of an *a priori* conception, assuming that the ape and man are as to kind identical, an assumption which is an *assumption*, not an inference from the personal facts of mankind. The physical connection between human life and animal life no one denies, just as no one denies the connection between the life of the animal and the life of the plant; but as there is a generic difference between the animal and the plant, so there is a generic difference, as psychology presupposes and confesses, a difference more pronounced, between the animal and man.

The difference is seen to be remarkable when we reflect on the structure of the body.

The anthropoidea, a sub-order of primate mammals, prevail in two sub-divisions, the first comprising monkeys and apes, the second man. The apes approach man in the form of the skull, in the brain and its convolutions, and in the teeth.

The orangs approach man nearest in the number of the ribs, having like man twelve pairs, and in the form of the cerebral hemispheres. The chimpanzee is nearest related to man in the form of the skull, in dentition and the length of the arms. The gorilla resembles him chiefly in the absolute capacity of the skull. Anatomists differ as to whether the chimpanzee or the gorilla comes nearest to man.

The average capacity of the Caucasian skull is 91-92 cubic inches; of the African skull it is 85 inches; of the Australian 75-79 inches. Of the gorilla the average capacity of the skull is 29 to near 35 cubic inches; of the chimpanzee 26; of the orang 25 inches.

The absolute physiological difference of man from the apes consists in the greater number and the greater irregularity of the convolutions of the cerebral hemispheres. According to the measurements above given, the cerebral hemispheres are also much larger compared with the cerebellum, and completely cover the latter. Man's entire brain is at least double the size proportionately of that of the gorilla. As Huxley states, the relative differences of the skulls of man and the gorilla are "immense." In man the cranial box overhangs the orbits; in the gorilla the forehead is hollowed out.\*

There are other remarkable structural differences which it is not important to enumerate, as they are of less direct significance for my purpose. The anatomical facts given demonstrate the immense difference of man *in kind* from the chimpanzee and the gorilla, apes which as to physical organization come nearest to man. Among those who insist that man is an animal, who would call Socrates a gorilla?

But great as are the physical differences they appear to be small when we fix attention on the thorough contrast between the unique properties of man as a personal being and the impersonal phenomena of the animal.

Here we reach the chief qualitative difference. It appeals to us so soon as we contemplate man's essential spiritual characteristics. These all center in personality, from which every moral and spiritual characteristic derives its peculiar quality.

As a personal being man is self-objective, whether we view him as the dynamic center of volition, or of knowledge, or of feeling. He is a subject who consciously is his own object. This proposition may be reversed. Man is an object who is consciously his own subject. Self chooses and self is chosen. In self-love the subject and object of volition are the same. Self knows and self is known. In self-consciousness the subject and object of knowledge are the same. Self feels and self is felt. That which feels and that which is felt are the same. Of man

\* On this branch of the discussion I acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor R. C. Schiedt.

we may predicate conscious self-feeling in contradistinction from sensation. Yet no confusion takes possession either of his moral activity, or of his rational inquiries, or of his emotional life. Man ever distinguishes between self as choosing and self as chosen, between self as knowing and feeling, and self as known and felt. Of these unique phenomena, personality expressed in concrete form by the pronoun I or ego, is the dynamic center. Unique these distinguishing phenomena are properly called because they are predicable absolutely of no object but a being that is personal. And for our present purpose it is important to say only that the idea of personality is realized by no being lower in the scale of existence than man.

An inference to the constitution of man drawn from the phenomena of the animal kingdom violates the scientific method in two ways: 1. Professing to investigate man's nature scientifically, that is, to reason exclusively from human facts to the being of man, the inference fails to take account of the distinguishing phenomena of man's nature. Not to name again the great physical differences, it ignores or denies the unique facts of self-conscious personality, namely, self-determined volition, the categories and logical processes of thought, the amenability of the conscience to God, and the irrepressible instinct of worship—facts which address us only from the human kingdom. 2. As a consequence of ignoring or denying man's moral and spiritual phenomena, the inference is drawn on the gratuitous assumption that man and the ape are members of the same order of animate life, an assumption that could stand scientifically only if sustained by facts essential to the nature of both. A scientific investigation into manhood infers that man is an animal by silently postulating, as the nerve of the whole investigation, that thought in its consideration of the two classes is dealing with the same object.

I might now pass on to discuss several other important questions on which many thinkers reason inductively, but in violation of the laws of induction. One question is whether from man's present battle with the destructive forces of his natural environment thought may infer man's original attitude as he stood when

fashioned by the creative energy of God? Does the scientific method justify an inference from man as he now is to man as he was in the beginning of his history?

Another question that claims consideration is whether by reasoning from the phenomena of the natural world according to the principle of induction thought may infer what God is and what is His relation to the natural world? Does the inductive method justify an inference from the natural to the spiritual?

Still another question arises: Whether if there be defects in the Biblical record induction may infer untruth in the objective history of revelation?

A discussion of the scientific method in its bearing on the import of these questions I reserve for a subsequent article.

## VI

### PENTECOST—THE BIRTHDAY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH.

BY REV. CYRUS CORT, D.D.

That Dr. Philip Schaff and other writers of Church History are correct in designating Pentecost as the Birthday of the New Testament Church, is manifest from the consideration of a few fundamental facts. The founding of the New Testament Church was dependent on the coming of the Holy Ghost in all the plenitude of grace as the quickening, converting, sanctifying Spirit of truth and holiness. This coming took place fifty days after the resurrection and ten days after the ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ and was conditioned by and dependent on the atoning death, the triumphant resurrection and glorious ascension of our blessed Saviour. In other words, the work of human redemption must be historically and objectively complete in the mediatorial life and person of the glorified Son of Man before the way was open for the coming and mission of the Holy Ghost in the proper New Testament sense. The problem of redemption required that the Mediator and Redeemer of our lost and ruined race should work out a perfect righteousness obediently to the will of the Father in heaven; yea, that the Captain of our salvation should become perfect through suffering and, as our surety and representative, carry our human nature triumphantly through the jaws of death and the gates of hades to the right hand of the Majesty on high. The Comforter could not come as the life giving, regenerating spirit of the New Testament Church until Jesus had finished his redemptive work and had become the glorified Son of Man. This is clearly the teaching of our Lord and Saviour, and the logic of events, as they unfolded themselves in the process of redemption, confirms the truth of these propositions.

In the Gospel of St. John 7:39 we are told that precious promises of life and salvation offered by the Lord Jesus to those who came to Him and trusted in Him as the Messiah had special reference to the future reception of the Spirit by his true disciples for the very important and significant reason that "The Holy Ghost was not yet given because that Jesus was not yet glorified." Here the glorification of Jesus is unmistakably set forth as a condition antecedent to the gift or coming of the Holy Ghost in the gospel sense of that term. And corresponding with this are those precious and comforting addresses of our blessed Lord to his sorrow-burdened disciples on the eve of his condemnation and crucifixion. They were sad because the Master had solemnly assured them that He was about to depart and would be put to death by wicked men. Sorrow filled their hearts because He said, "I go away and whither I go ye cannot follow me now." They took for granted that the withdrawal of His bodily presence would be an irreparable calamity. They felt that nothing could compensate them for the separation about to take place. But the compassionate Redeemer cheers their desponding spirits with the blessed assurance that His contemplated departure would open the way for the greatest blessings that God in mercy bestows upon the children of men. Although, to their weak faith and beclouded minds, nothing but evil could result from His departure, yet in the counsels of divine love and mercy it was far different.

Not until His bodily presence was withdrawn, in the way foretold, could they enjoy the saving fellowship of that other divine Comforter, Helper and life-giving Spirit who would fit them for the mansions of glory which He would prepare for them in the heavenly fatherland. "Nevertheless," in spite of your gloomy fears and forebodings, "I," who have never deceived you, "tell you the truth. It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send Him unto you."

When Jesus declares that "It is expedient for you that I go away," etc., He meant infinitely more than that it would be politic in the modern, mercenary sense of that word "expedient."

A better and nobler meaning formerly belonged to this term. When Jesus declares "It is *expedient* for you," etc., His disciples are assured, in the most unmistakable manner, by Him who cannot lie, that His departure would conduce to their highest eternal good. His departure would be in the best and deepest sense advantageous, profitable and necessary to their spiritual and everlasting welfare. Yea, his previous sojourn and ministry, in their midst, would be of no avail and their future deliverance could not be secured if He did not go away or depart in the way foretold by Himself and the holy prophets. He could only exhaust the curse and destroy the works of the devil by suffering, the just for the unjust, by personally overcoming the powers of death and hades, by rising victoriously from the grave and ascending the mediatorial throne of the universe as Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all. Hence although He had more than twelve legions (72,000) of angels at His command in the lowest depths of His humiliation, and could have blasted His persecutors in an instant, yet He allowed Himself to be led as a lamb to the slaughter. "He meekly bore the mighty load in groans and tears, in sweat and blood." For only thus, as He assured Peter, could the Scriptures be fulfilled. And only thus could the purposes of redeeming love, on which they were based, be fulfilled. Moses in the law, the prophets and the psalms, the entire Old Testament economy, set forth that Messiah must suffer these things to enter into His glory. Surely it was expedient for the fallen sons and daughters of Adam that Jesus should depart as He did, even though led by the rugged and bloody way of Calvary and the cross, that He might rescue them from the guilt and power of sin as their Surety and Redeemer. But the chief and specific truth which Jesus presents to reconcile his grief-stricken disciples to the thought of His speedy and tragic departure was the consequent coming and mission of the Holy Ghost, the blessed Comforter, in the covenant of grace and salvation. Mankind needed not only atonement for sin and a new life principle, but a Divine Agent to impart these benefits through means or channels of

grace designated by the glorified Head of the Church. At first thought it may seem strange that Jesus should speak of the Holy Ghost as one who had not yet come into the world and could not come until He had departed to the Father in heaven.

Had not the Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters at the creation of the world? Had He not inspired the prophets and holy men of old with wisdom from on high? Yea, had He not visibly descended in the form of a dove when the Father spake from heaven, "Thou art my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased?" Assuredly the Holy Spirit appeared on these and many other occasions, and yet there is a deep and precious truth in the words of Jesus when He seeks to console His disciples with the speedy coming of the promised Comforter. The previous manifestations of the Spirit's presence and power among men were, as Dr. Schaff tell us in the second edition of his "History of the Christian Church," pp. 59, etc., of a sporadic and transient character. But on this day (Pentecost), "the Holy Spirit took up his permanent abode in mankind as the Spirit of truth and holiness with the whole fullness of saving grace, to apply that grace, henceforth, to believers by means of the word and sacraments, etc."

The Holy Ghost had occasionally appeared in former times just as the only begotten Son revealed Himself as the Angel of the covenant long before His Incarnation or permanent assumption of our human nature in the fullness of time. But as yet the Holy Ghost had not begun His specific work as the Regenerator, Sanctifier and Comforter of the members of the New Testament Church. His coming and peculiar mission is inseparably connected in the plan of salvation with the mediatorial person and work of our Lord Jesus Christ. Our Saviour must finish His work in the economy of redemption before the Holy Spirit could come in the New Testament sense to apply or communicate the benefits of that work to the heirs of salvation.

We repeat the Death, Resurrection, Ascension and Glorification of Jesus Christ were necessary antecedent conditions to the proper, permanent coming and mission of the blessed Comforter. Jesus could not be the Second Adam, the new Supernatural Head

of regenerated humanity, until He had triumphed over sin, death and hell, and was enthroned as Prince and Saviour at the right hand of divine majesty and power. Thus He became the Fountain of eternal life to them that obey Him and receive the principle of His glorified corporeity as the new Head of mankind. Thus He reheaded or recapitulated our humanity and made it possible for the children of men to be recovered from the wreck and ruin of sin. We are complete in Him who is the Head of all principality and power and the first begotten from the dead, but without Him we are dead in trespasses and sins and can do nothing to escape from the ruin of the Fall. Jesus Christ is the principle and power of resurrection or resurgent life for all that trust in Him. It is the mission and prerogative of the Holy Ghost to quicken, guide and comfort the disciples of the blessed Master by bringing them into living union and communion with their glorified Head. The life of the glorified Son of man can alone be imparted to us by the gracious activity of the Holy Ghost in the new and better covenant of salvation. "He shall guide you into truth; He shall testify of me; He shall take of mine and show it to you;" yea, "He shall glorify me," are some of the precious promises of Jesus respecting the blessed Comforter. He is specifically active in the work of regeneration, conversion and sanctification. "After that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness that we have done; but according to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by His grace we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." (Titus 3: 4-7.) Through the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the holy sacraments the Holy Ghost works faith in our hearts, so that we become partakers of Christ and all the benefits of His great redemption.

The word which would otherwise be an empty sound becomes, through the illuminating presence of the Holy Spirit, "quick and powerful and sharper than a two-edged sword, a discerner of the

thoughts and intents of the heart." The Gospel is the wisdom and power of God unto salvation. The Sacraments are not products of the life of the Church. They are divine appointments ordained by the Lord Jesus as channels of His saving grace. He never baptized as did John the Baptist, or as did Peter and the other disciples after Pentecost, for the fundamental reason that baptism was to be in his name as coördinate with the Father and the Holy Ghost in the economy of salvation. The name of God stands for the essential being and attributes of Diety, the supernatural entity or divine element into which the subject of baptism was introduced. Hence in the nature of things, Jesus, as the second person of the adorable Trinity, never administered baptism.

But he instituted it by express command, as He also instituted the Holy Supper. They are the Sacramental seals of His regenerating and sanctifying grace by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Many of his teachings were prospective, intended for future guidance and edification when the Holy Ghost should come to call them to the disciples' remembrance and guide them into all truth. Such was His discourse in John 7, already referred to. Such, in a large measure, were His farewell discourses delivered in connection with the institution of the Holy Supper, as contained in chapters 14, 15 (vine and branches), 16, 17 of the Gospel of St. John.

The fact that Peter promptly responded to enquiring Jews on Pentecost, the birthday of the New Testament Church, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is unto you and to your children," etc., demonstrates that baptism was a divine ordinance previously instituted by the Lord Jesus as set forth in Mark 16: 16, and Matthew 28: 19 and 20, a component part of the plan of salvation along with the preaching of the Gospel.

Nor has any one a right to say dogmatically that immersion was the original mode of baptism and that none but adults were among the three thousand souls added to the disciples on Pente-

cost. Jesus and his followers had no such influence with the civil and ecclesiastical authorities at Jerusalem at that time as to command or secure the amount of water necessary to immerse or submerge three thousand persons in the precincts of the Holy City, and the reference to their "children" as entitled to the sign and seal of the new and better covenant was an invitation to every penitent Jew to come with all his house into the Ark of Christ's Church. In harmony with this was the baptism of Cornelius, Lydia, the Philippian jailor, and their households after the analogy of the administration of circumcision in the Old Testament Church. There was a fundamental difference between Christian baptism and that practiced by John the Baptist, as Paul's discourse to certain Ephesian disciples demonstrates. See Acts 19: 2-5. This transaction confirms all that has been said about the generic difference between the coming of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost and his previous manifestations. As Olshausen expresses it on John 7: 39, "The ministry of the Holy Spirit commences with the glorification of Jesus and the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost. \* \* \* The proper work of the Holy Spirit is regeneration, and the entire creative agency of God in the Souls of men; accordingly the New Birth essentially belongs to the New Testament."

Hence it was that John the Baptist, though greater than a prophet and greatest of men born of women, was less than the least in the Kingdom of Heaven; so much do the blessings and privileges of the New Dispensation transcend those of the Old. Hence it is that those who died before the coming of Christ were in a state of comparative limitation, "God having provided some better thing for us that they without us should not be made perfect," Heb. 11: 40. Hence Jesus could remind his disciples of their superior privileges and corresponding obligations, "Blessed are the eyes that see the things that ye see, etc., for many kings and prophets and holy men had aspired to this distinction without obtaining it. There was a sense in which the New Testament Church was potentially present in the person of Christ and of the Apostles even before His ascension and glorification and the

consequent coming of the Holy Ghost. All great historic movements have their premonitions and in a measure comprehend the end in the beginning. Good old Simeon could bless God in rapturous vision for permitting his eyes to behold the salvation of Jehovah even in the infant Jesus, Luke 2. Yea, there is a sense in which we can say, with our Heidleberg Catechism, question 54, "That the Son of God, from the beginning to the end of the world, gathers, defends and preserves to Himself by His Spirit and word out of the whole human race a church chosen to everlasting life, agreeing in true faith." Still further we can say Jesus is the antitype or archetype of humanity and God hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world. He is the informing principle of the whole creation which groans and travails in pain, waiting for the redemption of the body when the creature itself shall be delivered from bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God, Rom. 8.

But, speaking in definite historical phrase, we must say that Pentecost was the Birthday of the New Testament Church, for not till then did the Holy Ghost come and impart in full measure the divine-human life of the glorified Son of Man to the first members of the infant Church.

In harmony with the promise of the Comforter, as the Divine Agent, to bring them into gracious saving fellowship with Himself as the victorious Conqueror of death and hades and Head of the new creation, Jesus commanded His disciples to tarry at Jerusalem after His Resurrection: "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence \* \* \* Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." Then He visibly ascended into heaven from the Mount of Olivet and was glorified at the right hand of majesty and power.

In prayerful expectation the disciples awaited the fulfillment of this momentous promise. Nor had they long to wait. Ten days after His Ascension the Holy Ghost came in all the plenitude of grace on the day of Pentecost. The redemption wrought

out in the person of Christ and objectively complete is now applied to His disciples by the quickening power of the Holy Ghost. And what a marvelous change did the Holy Spirit make in the life and conduct of those disciples as He brought to them the grace and benediction of the glorified Son of Man? They were new creatures indeed, created of God in Christ Jesus. Christ was formed within them as the hope of eternal glory. Peter, who lately denied his Lord in a profane and cowardly manner—Peter now stands forth as a penitent confessor of his crucified and risen Redeemer, and with matchless courage, wisdom and power convicts his Jewish hearers of having crucified the Messiah in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. This Jesus, whom with wicked hands they had crucified and slain, “hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and here.”

Three thousand souls were baptized and gathered into the good Shepherd's fold as the immediate result of that first missionary sermon on the Birthday of the Christian Church. These were first fruits in the harvest of regenerated humanity. From that day to this the Gospel call to perishing sinners has resounded down the ages, and will continue to summon men to repent of their sins and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ as their only and all-sufficient Saviour, until time itself shall be swallowed up in the glorious consummation of all things at the second coming of our blessed Lord, to judge the quick and the dead according to deeds done in the body. The triumphs of the Christian Church during eighteen hundred and sixty years, in spite of the fury of persecuting Jews and Gentiles, is an overwhelming proof of the divinity of Christ Jesus and of the supernatural presence and power of the Holy Ghost in the covenant of grace and salvation. And we can console ourselves in this blessed assurance that He who hath begun a good work in us will confirm it unto the end, will perform it unto the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. A glorified immortality of body, soul and spirit in the life everlasting of

236 *Pentecost—The Birthday of the New Testament Church.*

the world to come is the portion of the inheritance of the faithful disciples of Jesus. But to whom much is given, of him shall much be required.

How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, bought by the precious blood of Jesus and brought home to all responsive hearts by the unction of the Holy Ghost?

## VII.

### WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH THE PHILIPPINES?

BY REV. WILSON F. MORE.

The Philippines are ours and no one seems to know what to do with them. Even the President, if he is correctly reported by the newspapers, is undecided and ready to consider suggestions bearing upon the solution of the difficult problem. And a difficult problem it certainly is, involving such a radical departure from well-established traditions that we search in vain for precedent to guide us, and holding in itself the possibilities of such far-reaching complications and consequences that we may well be greatly concerned about a right solution.

Something must be done. Military occupation and rule, from the American point of view, cannot be regarded otherwise than as an undesirable makeshift. It must speedily be superseded by some system of civil administration. What shall it be?

The President will undoubtedly be accommodated, perhaps even embarrassed, with innumerable suggestions. The practical politician will present a variety of schemes, all constructed with a view to provide the carpetbagger with opportunities for plunder. Learned and experienced statesmen will advocate plans varying as their views are determined by principles ranging from the ultra conservative to the wildly imperialistic. In addition to all these, there will be the more or less visionary schemes of theorists and idealistic dreamers. Of this nature, perhaps, is the following, which may be characterized as broadly humanitarian rather than as lofty but narrow American.

Assuming that the United States has become the arbiter of the fate of the Philippines, and that, therefore, it is incumbent upon her to decide what shall be done with them, she should now, first

of all, thoroughly convince herself, if possible, of the truth of the following propositions :

That Spain has proven herself unfit and incompetent to govern the Philippines.

That Spain has some interests there which deserve to be recognized.

That certain foreign powers, by reason of neighboring colonial possessions, have interests in the Philippines which might be recognized by courtesy but not as a matter of right.

That it is not desirable that the United States should permanently retain distant colonial possessions.

That the natives of the Philippines are at present unfit for self-government, but that they should be educated to govern themselves as soon as possible.

That meanwhile the Philippines should be governed in the interests of their own people rather than in the interests of any foreign power.

The foregoing propositions seem to be so self-evident to the American mind that there is probably no need to defend and discuss them. It remains, therefore, only to suggest a system of provisional government in which the principles underlying these propositions are duly recognized. It would require a governmental scheme something like this :

In its general outline and fundamental law it should be patterned after the government of the United States.

Its legislative department should consist of two houses, with powers corresponding, in the main, with those of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

Its House of Representatives should be composed of members chosen from and by the native population.

Its Senate should be composed of one Senator from each of the following powers that would be willing to participate in the scheme, namely, the United States, Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, Austria, Spain and Japan. The membership of this Senate should be gradually enlarged in the following manner: After six years the natives should choose, from among their

own number, two Senators, and every three years thereafter two additional ones, until the number of native Senators equals the number representing foreign governments.

Its executive power should be vested in the President of the United States and in a native Vice-President. The President should have absolute veto power until the Philippine Senate shall have attained its full membership, and after that a veto power such as he has in the United States.

The Vice-President should preside over the Senate and should have an appointing power such as the President has in the United States and subject to the same limitations.

The judicial power should be vested in the Supreme Court, composed of the Chief Justice of the United States, The Lord Chief Justice of England and a native Judge appointed by the Philippine House of Representatives.

The participating foreign governments should furnish, in equal numbers, the land and sea forces necessary to enforce the authority of the provisional government. These forces should be under the direction of the President, as commander-in-chief; and no native military force should be tolerated.

This provisional government should be maintained for at least twenty-one years, and longer if at the end of that period the natives, in the opinion of the President of the United States, are not yet competent to govern themselves.

The revenues for the support of the provisional government should be derived, in about equal proportions, from an internal revenue system and import duties which should not discriminate in favor of any foreign nation as over against any other.

Such a provisional government would subserve the best interests of the inhabitants of the Philippines and the reasonable ends of international commerce. It would be well adapted to educate the natives for self-government. It would do away with every excuse for national jealousy. It would preserve, in *statu quo*, the European balance of power. It would insure to each participating nation every advantage which, in the opinion of all, would be consistent with the general good.

To be sure, such a scheme of international coöperation on such a broad scale has never been attempted before. But what of that? It would only add one more to the sensations with which these closing years of the nineteenth century are treating the world. Indeed, it would seem to be a fitting climax with which to cap them all. America surprised the nations by entering upon a war in the interests of humanity. It was the unexpected that happened when the scene of the war was transferred to the distant Philippines. With marvelous achievements on land and sea, we brought the war to such a close that we now find ourselves in possession of territory which we do not want for ourselves and which we do not know how to give away. The Czar of Russia proposes a Peace Congress to consider the disarmament of the nations. The United States has been invited to participate in that congress of the nations. Let her return the compliment by inviting the nations of the Old World to join in an open-handed way to remove all occasion for strife on account of the Philippines, thus leading the van in inaugurating the movement for "the parliament of man, the federation of the world."

## VIII.

### EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

#### CHRIST'S PAROUSIA.

It has usually been supposed that no system of theology has a right to this name without containing a complete doctrine of eschatology, or of the last things. Such a doctrine, it was believed, could be drawn from the prophetic portions of Sacred Scripture, which were regarded as presenting a kind of map of the future, in which all the details of history were believed to be accurately indicated, provided only one had the ability to read them; and without this ability no one, it was thought, could have a very loud call to be a theologian.

The central event in the prophetic programme of the future, thus made out, was, of course, believed to be the second advent of Christ, who was expected to come in a visible form in the clouds of heaven, at the end of this world, to raise the dead, both good and bad, either simultaneously or at successive intervals, and then to execute the general judgment, after which there would be no more time, and all things would remain forever fixed. As to the time of this important event, of course, nothing definite could be stated, but in general it was believed to be near at hand. Christ Himself did not claim to know the day or the hour of His second coming, and we must not be wiser than He, although the signs of the times demonstrate that the end is not very far off. During the Middle Ages, as in the time of the primitive Church, it was believed that the day of the Lord was near; and the strength of this conviction seems to have been in inverse proportion to the conviction of the Lord's immediate presence with His Church here. The year one thousand, it was believed by many, would be the end of time. More recently the opinion has prevailed that the world will stand just six thousand years—a thou-

sand years for each day of creation—and that, according to the chronology adopted by Archbishop Usher, this time may now be believed to be nearly expired.

There is one point, however, in the traditional systems of eschatology in regard to which much uncertainty has prevailed, and, indeed, prevails still; and that is the doctrine of the *millennium*, or of the thousand years' glorious reign of Christ upon earth, during which Satan is to be bound, men are to sin no more, pain and death are to cease, and peace and blessedness are to prevail universally. So far as the element of time in the conception of the millennium is concerned, this may be taken either in a literal or in a symbolical sense—that is to say, the thousand years may be supposed to denote a definite or an indefinite period of time. But in regard to the relation of the millennium to the second coming of Christ there prevails a more serious difference of opinion. Some hold that this will precede, others that it will succeed, the millennium. According to the former opinion the world is destined to grow morally worse and worse, Satan's power is to go on increasing, and sin and wickedness are to abound until the Christian faith shall have nearly perished from the earth. Then Christ will suddenly come in the clouds of heaven, destroy antichrist, raise up the righteous dead, and bring in a reign of goodness and glory, which shall endure for a thousand years. This is the *pre-millennial* theory of the second advent. According to the opinion of others, however, the world will gradually be won for the kingdom of God by the moral operation of the Gospel under the coöperation of the Spirit of Christ, who is always present in it. The dispensation of the Gospel is not going to end in absolute failure, as the pre-millennial theory supposes. The Gentiles will all be converted, and afterwards the Jews, too, will accept the Gospel, Satan will be bound and no longer permitted to tempt men and nations, temptation and sin will cease, the righteous dead, or at least some of them, will be raised from their graves, and then Christ will gloriously reign, though in invisible form, for a thousand years; at the end of which period He will manifest Himself in bodily form, and bring to its consum-

mation the history of this world. This is the *post-millennial* theory of the second advent. Both theories, however, agree in this that they suppose that the final consummation can only come through outward *force* and *catastrophe*. For at the end of the thousand years Satan will again be loosed, and permitted to go forth to deceive the nations; in consequence of which there will be a great apostasy, and rebellion against God. But the rebels will be slain by fire from heaven; all the dead will then be raised up, the general judgment will be held, the wicked will be cast into the lake of fire, and the righteous will inherit the new heaven and the new earth, which will take the place of the present world.

Now this whole eschatological doctrine is beset with very great, if not with insuperable, difficulties. In the first place, there is something unethical about this millennial doctrine, in either of the forms in which it may be presented. For, if the triumph of the kingdom of God can be secured by simply binding Satan, and preventing him from tempting mankind, why, then, is he not bound now? And why is he to be let loose again at the end of the thousand years, and permitted once more to exercise his wicked influence over man? Is God not able to prevent this, or does He not want to prevent it? In the former case what becomes of His power, and in the latter case what becomes of His goodness? Then the element of time involved in this doctrine creates difficulty. The implication of the theory is that the time between the first and second advent must be comparatively short—at least only a few thousand years—and that the time of the end must now be quite near, for the consummation of every Christian's salvation is dependent upon it. This, however, is not at all in harmony with our present conception of world-time. Modern science has wonderfully enlarged our conception of time as well as of space. The few thousand years which were once supposed to have elapsed since the creation of the world have been extended into ages of inconceivably vast duration, and from aught that now appears ages of equally vast duration may still be before it. The world is doubtless going to grow old, but is by no means old yet. Though it has passed through aions of time, it is,

in fact, still young, and promises to run through many aions more. The presumption, therefore, created by our present conception of time is that Christ's coming must still be very far off, indeed. But does not this postponement of the second advent to a future inconceivably remote jar painfully upon our feelings, in view of the fact that we are accustomed to connect it with the consummation of our salvation? If the saints now exist in an intermediate state, waiting to be reunited with their bodies in order to the perfect consummation of their redemption, must not this time of waiting, even if it should only be a few thousand years, appear to be painfully long? But if, as some suppose, they are in heaven now in a disembodied state, and yet perfectly blessed, what use, then, can there be in a future reunion with the body? Would not that be a retrogression, rather than a progression, especially if the future body should be formed out of earthly material now reposing in the grave?

But there is a more serious difficulty than this connected with the time-element in the problem of Christ's second advent, and that is the fact that in the Synoptical Gospels Christ Himself represents it as quite near, *and certain to occur within the life-time of the then existing generation*; while two thousand years have now elapsed, and it has not occurred yet. At the close of His great eschatological discourse, recorded by all the Synoptists, He says, "This generation shall not pass away, till all these things be accomplished," Matt. 24:34. And among "these things" are the extinguishment of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars, and the coming of the Son of Man upon the clouds of heaven. Compare also Matt. 10:33. This was certainly the sense in which the language of Jesus was understood by His immediate disciples; and they, therefore, expected His second advent to occur in their lifetime. That such was their hope could only be denied by those who suppose that the apostles were infallible, and could not in any respect be mistaken. But that such an expectation did exist among the primitive Christians is evident from the fact that, in the time when the Second Epistle of Peter was written, the non-fulfillment of it had already

given occasion for unfavorable remark. "Where is the promise of His coming?" some said, "for from the day that the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." But if in the third or fourth generation of Christians already such questions arose, how much more must they arise now, after the lapse of two thousand years? Was Jesus, then, Himself mistaken in regard to this matter? Some have supposed that this may not have been impossible—that, as He knew not the day nor the hour, He may neither have known the manner of His *parousia*, but may have thrown His language into Jewish apocalyptic form without reflecting closely upon its full import. There are, however, others who think that there is a better way of dealing with the case than that.

Some of the most genial Christian thinkers of recent times, like Theodore Munger, Elisha Mulford and W. N. Clarke, whose *Outline of Christian Theology* was noticed in the January issue of this REVIEW, have come to the conclusion that the language of Christ, in its original and true meaning, could have referred to no outward visible coming at all, but must have looked to an inward spiritual presence with His people beginning immediately after His bodily departure from the earth. "The real advent of Christ," says Dr. Clarke, "is not an event by itself, but a spiritual process, long ago begun and still continuing." Indeed, it is not a *coming*, an 'εἰδεῖν, at all, but a *παρουσία* (from παρών), a *presence*, and is effective for salvation and judgment here and now. This view, if accepted, must serve to make our eschatological theory much more simple than that which has been commonly held. Prophecy ceases to be a map of the future. We shall no longer undertake to forecast the events of history, and current political and ecclesiastical events will no longer be pointed to as fulfillments of predictions in Daniel or in the Apocalypse. Our knowledge of the *last things* will be much less comprehensive than it used to be, but it will for that reason be all the more trustworthy.

This idea of Christ's *parousia* accords perfectly with His own ascension promise as reported in Matthew: "Lo, I am with you

alway, even unto the end of the world." And it is in harmony also with the teaching of the fourth Gospel, in which confessedly nothing is said about any future visible coming of the Son of Man, but in which much is said about an immediate spiritual presence of Christ with His people, following directly upon His visible going away from them. "I will not leave you orphans: I come unto you." "A little while, and ye behold me no more; and again a little while, and ye shall see me." That is the burden of His parting discourse in the Gospel of John. And His coming is so bound up with the coming of the Holy Spirit that the two are in fact one manifestation. But if this was the meaning of Jesus, how could the disciples have transformed this idea of a continual spiritual presence in the world, for its salvation and judgment, into the notion of a single historical event? In the simplest manner possible. We know that they misunderstood Him when He spoke of His death; and what more likely than that they should have misunderstood and even misreported Him when He spoke to them, in apocalyptic terms, of His *parousia* after His death? But why did He not correct them? Because true knowledge on this as on other subjects can only be acquired, in the way of moral activity, when the proper conditions for it are given in experience. Then the spirit will guide believers into all truth; but this itself is doubtless a very gradual process, extending through the ages of Christian history. But while they misunderstood its immediate import, the disciples still give us enough of the language of their Master to enable us now, in the light of the teaching of the Spirit and of the experience of the Church, to recover His meaning, and to perceive that, in His eschatological discourse, He must have had reference to a mode of coming wholly transcending the idea of a mere temporal and local manifestation at some distant point of time. Agreeably to this conception it is common now to perceive in Jesus' eschatological discourse a reference to the coming of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, as the proper commencement of the Christian dispensation, and to the destruction of Jerusalem, as the final judgment upon the old Jewish world, and the removal of a

mighty obstacle from the way of the progress of Christianity. This reference is doubtless correct; only it must not be limited to the two events just named. Every event and every crisis in the history of the world and of the Church, whereby the Kingdom of God is promoted, involves in fact a new coming of Christ. The destruction of the old Roman Empire and the judgment upon the Catholic Church in the Protestant Reformation were as real manifestations of Christ as was the advent of the Holy Spirit or the destruction of Jerusalem. It needs scarcely to be said that this conception of a progressive manifestation of Christ in the history of the world does not exclude the idea of a final and most glorious manifestation when that history shall be concluded. The progressive manifestation will culminate, doubtless, in a final manifestation, which will bring to its ultimate completion the entire process of the world.

But if this view of the *parousia* be correct, what then becomes of the doctrine of the millennium, which has hitherto formed so large a part of our traditional eschatologies? That doctrine, of course, goes into the limbo of exploded theories. And the loss of it can be borne the more easily as there never was any agreement of opinion in regard to its meaning, any way. It was never a dogma, or an article of faith, of the Church, but only an opinion about which men disputed. And, in fact, it has no sufficient Scriptural basis for it ever to become a dogma. The only foundation for it is a single passage in a highly symbolical book of doubtful canonicity. But if the doctrine of the millennium be untenable, will not the doctrine of the resurrection, which has been so intimately connected with it, break down likewise? The doctrine of the resurrection of the *corpse* at a distant future, yes; but not the doctrine of the resurrection of the *dead*. But the New Testament nowhere teaches any resurrection of the corpse, or of the flesh (*resurrectio carnis*). Even the idea of a resurrection of the *body*, as something apart from the self or person, does not belong to the New Testament. What is taught is that the *dead* will arise, or stand up (*αναστήσονται*, whence *ανάστασις*), with renewed life, in a spiritual organism or body corresponding

to their new sphere of existence ; and that this rising-up will take place immediately after death. At least such is the conviction of an increasing number of Christian thinkers in regard to the teaching of the New Testament. Living and conscious spirits cannot exist in an unorganized form. Unless, therefore, we are willing to suppose that the dead exist in a state of joyless unconsciousness for countless ages, we cannot suppose that the resurrection body will be a material product emerging from the grave at a time inconceivably remote in the future. St. Paul's final thought on the subject of death seems to have been, not that it leads to ages of virtual non-existence, but that it issues in an immediate joyous life in the presence of Christ, where the person appears, not as naked spirit, but clothed in a spiritual body or house from heaven (Phil. 1:23, 2 Cor. 5:12). And the resurrection to which St. Paul so earnestly desired to attain was certainly not an event far off in time, but a condition into which he expected to enter as soon as he should close his eyes in death. The Jews undoubtedly expected a resurrection of the material body at the end of this world, which they, at times at least, believed to be close at hand ; and this idea no doubt often played into the thinking of Christian believers and more or less colored their conceptions. When Jesus said to Martha, "Thy brother shall rise again," she answered, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection of the last day." Martha's notion of the duration of time was not like ours, and yet she derived but little comfort from the thought of a resurrection so far off. But Jesus answered her : "I am the resurrection, and the life ; he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live : and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die." How this language could ever be reconciled with the notion of the resurrection as an event far off in time it is certainly difficult to understand. It seems to have been uttered for the very purpose of correcting that notion. What Martha is to do is to cease looking for the resurrection of her dead brother at the last day, and to believe him to be living in Christ now. That Christ's language in this case referred merely to the return of Lazarus to the present life,

and has no further meaning, we think few will pretend. From this it does not follow, however, that the "last day" will not be an important epoch in the existence of the human individual. The glorious manifestation of Christ at the end of the world will be the occasion of the final glorification of the individual as well as of humanity collectively ; and if it should be proposed to call this the resurrection of the last day there could be no objection, provided only the previous reality of a blessed life in heavenly abodes be fully recognized.

If the general view of Christ's *parousia* presented in this article be accepted as correct, we believe that it will secure to the Christian faith a number of important advantages. In the first place, it will give to the Christian life in this world a brighter and more cheerful character than is possible under any of the older views. It will inspire in Christian believers a sense of Christ's presence with them here and now, which they cannot have so long as they are taught to believe that they are living in a world from which Christ is practically absent, and over which Satan is allowed to exercise dominion at his own bad pleasure. This view will give to the Church the assurance that, during the ages of Christian history, she does not exist in a state of widowhood, and to her children the assurance that they are not left orphans. That feeling of widowhood was the feeling largely during the middle ages, as appears still from many of the hymns of that period. The Church felt herself forsaken of Christ in a strange world lying in wickedness, and instead of making efforts for the salvation of that world she merely prayed to be delivered from it. And meanwhile the pope was believed to be the guardian of her children ! And such a guardian ! But if Christ Himself be felt to be present with His Church continuously, according to His promise, to exercise judgment upon sin and to carry forward His work of salvation among men, there will be no need of any vicegerent, and Christians will enjoy a sense of security and peace which must otherwise be impossible.

Again, the view here presented gives value to the moral life in this world, and becomes an impetus to earnest Christian work.

More than once has the doctrine of a speedy coming of Christ for the destruction of the world served as an excuse for the neglect of Christian duties, sometimes honestly and sometimes perhaps dishonestly. Luther opposed missionary work among the heathen on the ground that the end of the world was so near at hand that there was no longer any use in it. The Pope was antichrist; and the Pope being overthrown, as he was shortly to be, the end would have come, and the unchristianized nations must perish. So there is reason to believe that there are persons now who neglect to work for the Christianization of the world under the mistaken notion that the world is never to be Christianized. Their theory that the devil must rule this world until Christ shall come and destroy him or bind him paralyzes their efforts for its improvement. They do nothing to make the world happier and better, because they think, or pretend to think, that nothing can be done so long as Satan is not bound. We have heard preachers laboring to prove to *very small congregations* that the world is too wicked to be converted and brought into the Church, but the "little flock" will get even with it when they shall see the Lord coming to destroy it.

Finally, this view of the *parousia* of Christ, and of the resurrection of the dead which it implies, imparts an attractiveness to the life after death, which is not possible under the traditional view of the second advent. If this view be correct, then there is room to say, indeed, that the dead who die in the Lord are *now blessed*. They live with Christ and with each other. They are not waiting to be saved, but they are saved now. And they are not idle, but active in the service of God and of His Kingdom. If the view here under consideration be correct, then existence beyond death is not inaction—not an idle or unconscious waiting for something to occur—but action, moral action involving moral development and progress. There is, then, no longer any Hades, where men are as shades, sleeping an aionian or eternal sleep, nor any purgatory, where the stains are burned out of imperfect Christians; but there is a life beyond death, a most real and active life, where moral development, repentance, and the attain-

ment of Christian character are still possible. In fact, *morally considered*, the life beyond death is only a continuation of the life which now is.

It remains only to say, in conclusion, that the view of Christ's parousia presented in this paper does not imply that the world will last forever. There will be a consummation of the Kingdom of God, which is now being worked out in the history of our world. This world has a definite goal which is to be reached; and when it is reached, there will be established a new order of things. Science teaches us that this world can not last forever. Its forces are being dissipated, and it must some time cease to be a fitting theatre for human development. Then human history here must end. But will it have an absolute end? Perhaps the fittest answer is that we do not know.

---

#### GOVERNOR PINGREE ON TRUSTS.

The annual message of Governor Pingree, of Michigan, who was re-elected to the same office last November, is in many respects a remarkable document. It is remarkable for its omission of the ordinary political stock platitudes of such documents, and for its broad and liberal discussion of economic and social questions which are of universal interest to the American people at the present time. Among the questions thus discussed are those relating to the management of railroads, the method of taxation, and the granting of valuable municipal franchises to private corporations, for which generally no adequate return is received. In the manner of assessing taxes, according to Mr. Pingree, the greatest injustice prevails, inasmuch as large accumulated, and especially corporate, capital generally manages to dodge its share of the burdens, which are then usually thrown upon the shoulders of the poorer classes, who are least able to bear them; and here there is urgent need of reformation on the part of our Legislatures. But it is to the trusts and combines of capital for productive and economic purposes, which now flourish so vigorously and threaten at no distant day to control every industry

in the country, that the Governor devotes his chief attention ; and it is proposed here to make this the occasion of a brief discussion of the subject, for which its general importance will be our justification.

Trusts are of comparatively recent development in the economic life of America. It is in fact only within the last quarter of a century that the American public has become familiar with them. The first evidences of a tendency in this direction appeared in the efforts of railroads to pool their business and keep up rates. This tendency had gone so far in 1887 that it was supposed to be necessary to do something to check it, and the Inter-State Commerce Law was enacted by Congress, but, so far as the end contemplated is concerned, it has proven a practical failure. Soon the same tendency began to manifest itself in other departments of industry, and seriously to threaten the principle of competition ; and, to meet the danger, Congress, in 1890, passed the Anti-Trust Law. But this, too, has proven a failure. In fact, it is only since this law has gone into effect that the evolution of the trust has been most rapid ; and now, in spite of some feeble legislative opposition, it has practically revolutionized our whole method of industry, and scattered to the winds all our previous economic theories and traditions. Up to a quite recent time it was believed that free competition was the highest law of economic well-being. To be free to sell and buy in any market one pleases, and to hire one's labor to any employer one chooses, was believed to be the surest road to prosperity, both individual and national. The only danger to us was believed to be in the cheap goods manufactured in foreign lands. If we could but keep our labor markets from being debauched by the "pauper labor" of Europe, it was thought, then we would be a rich and happy people. And so all our legislative energies were directed to the protection of the American market and the fostering of American industries. If that end was accomplished, then it was thought, competition would secure the highest wages to the laborer, and the lowest prices to the consumer, and all would be happy.

But instead of that happy condition, what do we behold now? Competition almost wiped out, and all the leading industries of the country concentrated in a few over-grown corporations, or multiple corporations, called *trusts*, with hundreds of millions of dollars invested in each combine, and prices and wages dictated by the managers of these soulless concerns. And this has been the result of all the pains we have been at in protecting and fostering American industry! Governor Pingree gives a list of one hundred and twelve industries thus controlled by trusts, whose aggregate capital is nearly three and a half billions of dollars. Among the products of these industries are such necessary articles as the following: glucose sugar, window glass, iron ore, coal and coke, mattresses, paper, rubber goods, tin plates, biscuits and crackers, beef cattle, oatmeal, school books and coffins. It will be seen, accordingly, that no child can either be educated or buried without paying tribute to some trust. But the Governor's list is only a partial one. The *Financial Chronicle*, as quoted in the *Outlook* for February 18, 1899, reports a list of eleven trust companies formed only during the past year, with an aggregate capital of \$916,000,000. The highest capitalization reached by any one of these new concerns is \$200,000,000, and the lowest \$25,000,000. The first is the Federal Steel Company, and the last the National Gas, Electric Light, Heat and Power Company.\* Of course, here all competition is at an end. These combines, when once rightly under way, will embrace all the industry of the same kind in the country, and they can have no competitors. The managers of these mammoth concerns, when once in full working order, will be absolutely free to pay what wages they please to laborers and to charge what prices they please for goods. And not only is this method applied in manufacturing. The department or corporation store is

\* Since the above was written, the astounding statement has been made on the floor of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, by Mr. Woodruff, of Philadelphia, that during the months of January, February and the first half of March of the present year, forty-two combinations have been effected, whose aggregate capital reaches the enormous sum of \$1,106,300,000. Thus the process of the concentration of capital is going on with constantly accelerated speed.

the application of it in merchandizing ; and the consequence of it is the passing-out of business of the small tradesman, whose warerooms are rotting to pieces, and who himself must either become a tramp or afterwhile appear as clerk, or floor walker perhaps, in one of the big concerns. There is only one industry that has not yet fallen into the hands of the trust, and that is *farming*. But in the present tendency of things, this is bound to go the same way. It is becoming more difficult every year for the small farmer to hold on to his own land ; and if the break once begins, the process of expropriation will be very rapid. Even now it is impossible for any man without considerable capital ever to become a landowner. And when the corporation farm shall once be fairly established, there will no longer be room for the individual farmer. There can then be only millionaire landowners, on the one hand, and tenant farmers, on the other.

The argument usually made in favor of the trust is that it cheapens productions, and so makes *possible* lower prices for goods and higher wages for labor. It cheapens productions, first, because, with the use of machinery, work on a large scale is more profitable than work on a small scale. It saves the necessity of the multiplication of buildings, machinery, clerks and laborers. If all the shoes worn in the country could be made in one shop, under one management, they could be made cheaper than if they are made in many shops under different management. And then the combination of industry cheapens production because it eliminates the waste of competition. If competition be unchecked, the multiplication of industrial establishments in the same line may go to such an extent as to involve positive loss, as when two enterprises of the same kind are planted in a locality in which only one can be supported ; and the loss thus entailed will in the end fall upon the entire community. It follows, then, that corporate enterprise must be more economical than individual enterprise, and that trusts must be able to sell cheaper goods and to pay higher wages than individual operators could. The validity of this argument is acknowledged by the socialists ; who, however, contend that, for this reason, the means of produc-

tion should be nationalized, so as to give the advantages of monopolistic production to the public, and not to private individuals or corporations, who are not fit to be entrusted with such power. If the trust managers were perfectly fair, and wise, and good men, without any particle of human selfishness in them, and bent not at all upon private gain, but only upon public weal, then, though there might still be some objection, there would probably not be much complaint against the existence of monopolies and trusts. But, unfortunately, these men are just like other men, affected with the same infirmities and passions. They are not supremely unselfish and wise, as they would have to be in order to exercise in a manner that should be free from public peril the great power of the wealth which their monopolistic methods enable them to extract from the people. A man who is worth three or four hundred millions of dollars must either possess the wisdom and the goodness of a god, or he must be a dangerous man in a community. But the men who manage the monopoly trusts, with all the gigantic powers which they involve, are not paragons of unselfish wisdom and goodness. They are men of superior business qualifications and talents, doubtless, but not of most tender consciences and human sympathies; and they are willing to use their natural gifts simply for their own personal advantages. This, indeed, is in most cases the secret of their success. These captains of industry are not hampered by any tender sympathies or any scruples of conscience, and hence they grow into millionaires. And such men will not use the monopoly power which the trust and the combine confer for the benefit of the public. They will not sell goods cheap and pay high wages for labor, just because they are able to do it. On the contrary, they will sell their wares at the highest prices which the public can stand and hire laborers at the lowest wages at which men can live.

But even if the trust accomplished all that is sometimes claimed for it in the way of cheapening productions, lowering prices and raising wages, there would still be grounds of objection to the principle of the trust. For the chief end for which

society exists is not the cheapening of productions, nor the creation of millionaires, but the general development of the highest and best quality of manhood. And to this end there is required a large degree of economic as well as political freedom. But the principle of freedom and the principle of monopolistic industry are not compatible principles. Hence feudalism and slavery have never been consistent with the highest development of manhood. What has been good for the lords and for the masters has not been good for the vassals and for the slaves. And yet a new species of slavery more grievous than any that has yet existed is the end towards which the present monopolistic movement of economic life inevitably tends. Let this tendency once be fully wrought out. Let all branches of industry be concentrated in their respective corporations, with boards of managers residing in New York City. These boards will regulate the amount of output in each industry, the number of men to be employed, the wages to be paid, the prices to be charged for goods, and the agents to be selected in each community for selling them. It may be said that this is an over-drawn picture. But if the principle of monopoly is good it must be good when carried out to this extreme extent. And in any case it is to this extreme point that things are tending and at which monopolists are aiming. But when this extreme point—this paradise of capitalism—shall have been reached, what will then have become of the men of the country? There will then be no men left. All that will be left will be corporation managers and slaves. For, as Governor Pingree says forcibly in the message before us, "When there shall be but one source from which the consumer can obtain his supplies, but one employer to whom the laborer can offer his services, both consumer and laborer will be slaves." And when that slavery shall have been established, what will have become of the government, of the nation, and of the country? On this point we can not do better than to quote several paragraphs from the message which has led to these reflections.

"A democratic republic," says Mr. Pingree, "cannot survive the disappearance of a democratic population. When our hun-

dreds of thousands of free merchants have become the mere hirelings of vast mercantile corporations which have crushed them out of business ; when the little shops, in which our people trade with their neighbors, have disappeared in ruins before the growth of a few enormous establishments in each town which absorb all the trade ; when all the great industries have been concentrated in the hands of a few gigantic corporations ; when the yeomanry of the farms have lost their lands to great proprietors, and have sunk to the condition of the tenant and the serf ; when the artisan may offer his services to but one great corporate employer in his own trade—and shall be utterly at the mercy of that one—where shall the republic find the independent voter, the free man, to govern it in peace, to defend it in war ? There will no longer be men in this country ; there will be only, on one side, corporation managers, and on the other, a mass of servile and dependent slaves.

“There is no father of a family to-day who has lived long enough to raise a son to early manhood who does not feel the awful pressure of the conditions I have attempted so feebly to describe. A short quarter of a century ago a boy who had industry and resolution could be thrust upon the world with a few hundred dollars in his pocket, with a fair assurance that he could go into some sort of modest business for himself, and make his way to independence. To-day such a career is impossible. All the avenues of success are occupied by these vast aggregations of capital whose crushing competition would ruin him. To enter the battle of life with the slightest hope of success one must have hundreds of thousands of dollars, and even then he must look about him and invest his capital in a combine or it will be lost at the first venture. Individual enterprise is without opportunity, without hope. Individuality is fast disappearing from the land. The free, self-reliant American is becoming more and more rare. We are becoming a nation of corporate masters who lack the natural humanity of individual employers, and of helplessly dependent servants. \* \* \* \*

“I have always been a loyal Republican. I am a Republican

still. But I prefer to believe that the Republicanism of Abraham Lincoln is superior to that of a more modern type. The party of Lincoln was not organized merely to enfranchise the black race, but to preserve the liberties, the dignity of manhood of every citizen of whatever race or color. Aside from the principles on which it conducted the war for the preservation of the Union, the policy to which it has been most devoted was that of the protective tariff. This policy has always been defended, not merely as affording living prices for American products in the domestic market, but, above and beyond all, as securing protection to American labor and American manhood, and adding to the dignity and independence of the American artisan and farmer. We sought to keep out of our market the cheap products of foreign labor, which was so poorly paid, lest our own labor should in time, by being compelled to compete with such labor, be degraded to its level. We have by this means built up a manufacturing interest greater than that of any other nation on earth. We passed to the first rank in this respect during the year just past, during which Great Britain, our only rival, was pushed to the second place. We are now confronted by these industries which we have so painstakingly and at such sacrifice fostered and built up—with an implied understanding at least that they would, by competition among themselves, furnish the consumer with goods at the lowest possible price commensurate with good wages—gathered into the hands of a few corporations and trusts, who, while still demanding protection from the government, use their awful power to kill all domestic competition, and to bring about the very condition with respect to labor which the tariff system was designed forever to prevent. Shall we permit these industries, fostered by national sacrifices and national wisdom, to be absorbed by a few heartless exploiters and to be used as a weapon for crushing American manhood into a slavery more appalling, because more helpless, than that of the black slaves whom Abraham Lincoln emancipated?"

But what can be done to prevent such a result? What can be done to save this nation from being ruined by the same causes

which ruined the nations of antiquity? For history tells us that it was wealth and luxury among the few and poverty and vice among the many that proved the ruin of Babylon, of Egypt, of Greece, and of Rome. In Pliny's judgment it was the *latifundia*, or great estates of the rich proprietors, that caused the downfall of Italy. And in this country the danger is greater at the present moment than it is in monarchical Europe, because there is here no powerful political aristocracy, strong in the prestige of ancient traditions, to stand between the rapacity of the rich and the helplessness of the poor; and the downward course must here be so much the more rapid, unless some means can be discovered to arrest it and give the starving proletariat a new chance of decent existence. Of this, however, many are ready to despair. They think the disease is beyond remedy. The monopolistic movement is supposed to be impelled onward by a power over which human thought and volition have no control. This power has its origin in the laws of nature themselves, and it would be as vain to try to resist it as it would be to resist the motion of the winds or tides. It is intrenched, moreover, in the customs, and laws, and constitution of the state. It has acquired vested rights which must protect it against all civil and legal assaults, and which the courts may always be relied upon to defend. Hence the lawyer and the statesman know of no remedy against the wrong which it inflicts; and the politician wants no remedy, because the monopolies and combines, whatever may be said against them, and whatever he himself may say against them at election times, are useful as furnishing the money for campaign purposes. Thus the outlook for the future seems just now to be dreary enough; and that the monopolistic and capitalistic forces now at work will, if allowed to continue to operate unchecked, at no distant day make this a nation of slaves and beggars no thoughtful man can doubt.

Governor Pingree, however, is not of the opinion that these forces will always be allowed to operate unchecked. He is not a mere pessimist, who only sees that things are wrong and has no idea that they can be amended. He is a *meliorist*, who is aware

of the wrong, but believes in the possibility of improvement. And that, we believe, is the right state of mind for the American citizen and statesman to be in. The American people, whatever present signs there may be to the contrary, will not allow themselves to be hopelessly enslaved without a determined effort to save themselves. They are too intelligent and virtuous a people for that. They may bear much and endure long, but there will come a time when they "will know what to do about it." Governor Pingree refers to the case of slavery as an illustration of the manner in which the constitutional and legal hedges that have been built around some gigantic wrong may be broken down, when the time of forbearance is past, and how the violated rights of humanity may be vindicated. The rights of monopolistic capitalism are not any more strongly intrenched in custom and law than were the rights of slavery, and when the time shall have come a way will be found by which they may be dissolved with as little regard for ceremony. The "new slavery" will not be any more successful than was the old. It is to be hoped that the emancipation may come in the way of peaceful evolution rather than in the way of violent revolution. But in some way it must come, and they are not the best friends of the peace and stability of society who cry peace when there is no peace. We may not be able now to suggest any plan or scheme for the relief of the economic pressure and the reconstruction of the financial order. But in due time the scheme will be discovered. If it can not be untied, the knot will be cut. At present perhaps nothing more feasible may suggest itself than the socialization of the means of production in so far as they may have been converted into monopolies. This would include the means of transportation, the mines, and some forms of industry which can only be carried on in a corporate capacity. Should that be found to be the only solution of the difficulty, then that solution would be adopted without so much as asking permission of those whose rights are now supposed to be so exclusive. Such a solution would give to Society the benefit of monopolistic production—high wages and cheap goods—with the attending monopolistic

curse. But the question is not now concerning any particular scheme or plan. The thing of first importance is that the public mind should be awakened to the danger threatening the common weal from the source here indicated. And in this view such utterances as those of Governor Pingree are of the highest importance. If they shall serve to warn the "lords of Mammon" of the danger of carrying things too far they will have accomplished a good purpose, and if they fail in that they will then serve to teach the public how to take care of itself and defend its rights. But in any case it is significant that a man who is known to entertain such views could be re-elected Governor of a great State. It shows the present drift of public sentiment in at least one portion of our Union.

---

#### OVERFLOWING GRACE.

We have before us a book entitled "The Church for Americans." Its author is an Episcopalian, or, as he would probably himself prefer to be called, an "Anglo-Catholic." His name is William Montgomery Brown, and he is Archdeacon of Ohio. The object of this work is to prove to the American people that the Anglican Church, with that branch of it in the United States commonly called "The Protestant Episcopal Church," is not only a true Church, but the only true Church that exists on earth. What constitutes the Church, according to the theory of the Archdeacon, is the "Historic Episcopate" extending in unbroken, tactful succession from the apostles down to the present time. Now it is true that the Greek and Roman communions also possess such an Episcopate, and they are, therefore, branches of the true Church. But still, for certain reasons, they are not quite as true and good branches as the Anglican. The goodness of the Roman branch, for instance, has been considerably impaired by the usurpations of the Bishop of Rome, whose chief sin, though, seems to consist in the fact that he will not recognize the validity of Anglican orders when that validity is so plain to Anglicans themselves. The Anglican Church, it is here con-

tended, never was a branch of the Roman Church. It was established directly by the apostles. St. Paul himself probably visited the island of Britain, and ordained bishops there, as he did elsewhere. The subsequent submission to Rome, and incorporation with the Roman Church for a thousand years, did not affect the succession of the English Episcopate. It still derives its origin from the apostles, as can be proven by perfectly good and reliable documents. And this is what should commend this Church to the confidence of the American people. They may be sure that here they have a Church that is perfectly safe, for the title-deed of its Episcopate has been pronounced perfectly good by its own best lawyers. And the author of this volume makes no secret that he is writing for the purpose of inducing "Denominationalists" as well as "Roman brethren" to connect with this only true Church. Nor has he any doubt of the effect of the argument. "Other things being equal," he says, "we feel sure that Americans who have any regard for antiquity and for the predominating judgment of Christendom will feel obliged to ally themselves with Episcopacy either in the Anglican or in the Roman communion rather than with any of the various forms of a self-constituted ministry as found in Denominationalism," p. 206. If he cannot make Anglicans, then he hopes at least to make Romanists; for anything is better than the Christianity of such Denominations as, for instance, the Presbyterians, Methodists, Lutherans or Reformed.

And according to the Archdeacon's theory of Christianity we believe that his preference of Romanism to Denominationalism is entirely logical; only we would reverse the relation between Anglicanism and Romanism, and give the latter the first place; for if we could suppose the grace of salvation to be tied to such an institution as the episcopate we should prefer one in regard to whose formal validity there has never been any doubt to one whose validity must constantly be defended. The author of this volume holds, with many others of his communion, though, we are glad to be able to add, not with all, that the reality of the Church depends upon the existence therein of the episcopal order,

which is perpetuated by an unbroken series of "cononical consecrations;" and that it is this that makes the Church a grace-bearing institution. "The Church of Christ, which has been perpetuated through the Historic Episcopate," he says, "is the appointed ark of Gospel salvation, and only by entering it can a person place himself in assured covenant relation with God," p. 188. And again he says: "This Church which has been perpetuated through the Historic Episcopate is the depository of sacramental grace, of which the Apostolic ministry is the only authorized dispenser," p. 194. "Valid sacraments," that is, sacraments administered by priests Episcopally ordained, "when received in faith and repentance, assure the recipient that he is a child of God and an heir and joint heir with Christ to the life which now is and to that which is to come. Nor is this all. Such sacraments also remit sins and convey strength to live a life of righteousness," p. 195. But only *such* sacraments, that is, sacraments administered by persons Episcopally ordained, not sacraments administered by the "self-constituted ministers" of the Denominations, can have this effect. Sacraments dispensed by "Apostolic ministers," and only such, are "channels of grace." Channels of grace are of no account unless they lead back to some "depository of grace," and such depository exists only in the "Church perpetuated through the Historic Episcopate." There being no such depository or store of grace in the Denominations, of course their sacraments can not be "channels of grace," nor can they "remit sins and convey strength to live a life of righteousness."

This is all logical and consistent, doubtless, according to Anglo-Catholic premises. It leaves the "Denominations" terribly in the cold. In fact, according to the principles of this theology, there is no hope for them at all. They and their people are aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. For where there is no historic episcopate there can be no priesthood; and where there is no priesthood there can be no sacraments, or channels of grace; and where there are no channels there can be no grace; but where there is no grace there can be no Christians. Now

all that seems to be correct as a matter of logic, and if the premises are correct the conclusion must be correct. But, after all, there is a difficulty about it, and it is a difficulty that gives the Anglo-Catholic no small amount of trouble. There is the fact that the members of the Denominations have all the appearance of being as good Christians, to say the least, as are the members of the Episcopal communions, whether Anglican or Roman. For himself, of course, the Anglo-Catholic might think that this is but a deceptive appearance—that these apparently saintly men and women in the various Denominations are only hypocrites or the dupes of hypocrites. But it would not do to tell this to the American people, especially when trying to persuade them to come into the "true fold," for they would either doubt the sanity of the man who should do it or suppose that he doubted their sanity; in either case his efforts to convert them would remain fruitless. The Archdeacon of Ohio feels this difficulty in the volume before us. He feels how preposterous would be the assertion that the members of the Denominations, who constitute by far the larger portion of the religious population of America, are not Christians at all; and, indeed, it may be doubted whether he himself really holds so preposterous a view. In fact, he acknowledges, though somewhat hesitatingly and grudgingly, that among the members of the Denominations there may be many good Christians, who must be regarded as in some sense members of the "One, Holy, Catholic Church of Christ." They must be members of the Church; for if they were regarded as Christians, and yet not as members of the Church, then it would follow that people can be Christians without the Church; and we can easily see what a difficulty that would create in the Archdeacon's theology. But how does he save his theology, while he admits that there may be Christians and Church members outside of any Episcopal communion where the channels of grace are not supposed to be regularly open? In a very simple way. To the question: "How do you account for the blessing which has attended the various denominations, if they are not true Churches of Christ?" he answers: "In the same way that we ac-

count for the success of the Young Men's Christian Association or of the Salvation Army. *God's abounding grace constantly overflows its channels,*" p. 202.

The italicizing of the last sentence is ours. Such a sentence is worthy of being italicized. Here, then, there is some hope for the Denominations after all. The members of these may be saved, too; howbeit they can be saved only by the undesigned agency of the Church with the Historic Episcopate. The dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' tables, and so the Denominationalists may be nourished by the grace which drips from the sacramental channels that extend through the Episcopal communions. Happy provision for the dogs of the Denominations! For what they believe themselves to be getting through the agency of their own "self-constituted ministry" comes to them really from the precious palms of Episcopal hands. Could "invincible ignorance" be better cared for? But there seems after all to be one independent fountain of grace in the Denominations themselves, namely, the sacrament of *baptism*. Baptism appears to occupy a peculiar position in this Anglo-Catholic theology, although the same peculiar position belongs to it also in Roman theology. It does not seem exactly to belong to the system of sacramental channels through which grace is conveyed about in the Church. At any rate, it is taught that, no matter by whom performed, if administered by water in the name of the Holy Trinity it will regenerate the soul that duly receives it and graft it into the body of Christ, p. 201. Instead of being a channel extending from the body of the Church with the Historic Episcopate, and overflowing with the grace stored there, it seems rather like a *bottle* which can be carried about and will empty itself of its contents by whomsoever it may be opened, or like a mystic charm which will yield its results to any one who may chance to know the secret of its performance. Or must this result, after all, be supposed to be connected with something that takes place in the Church with the Historic Episcopate? When the Methodist minister administers baptism which regenerates a soul must that result after all be supposed to be due to some-

thing that is done or *intended* by the Episcopal office of the true Church? The Anglo-Catholics may be supposed to be not ignorant of the power and effect of "intention" in ecclesiastical operations; in fact, the Pope has recently been giving them some lessons on that subject; and if they were to hold that the baptism of the Denominations is efficacious because the Church *intends* it to be so, then the effect of Denominational baptism would be no exception to the theory of grace constantly overflowing its Episcopal channels. In fact, all the good that exists in the world might thus be referred to the Historic Episcopate as its efficient or operative cause, and the results accomplished by the Denominational ministry might be set to the account of the *efficient intention* of the Episcopate. If this suggestion is of any value to the Anglo-Catholic for the maintenance of his theory of overflowing grace he is welcome to it.

But what sort of thing is this grace which thus constantly overflows its channels and brings blessings into the barren wastes of Denominationalism? According to the Archdeacon's representation one would suppose it to be some sort of a fluid, obeying in its behavior the laws of a fluid substance; for it is stored up in an Episcopal reservoir, and may be conveyed by means of certain conduits to points where it is wanted. Electricity is something that may be thus conducted from one place to another by means of a system of wires; and it, too, sometimes overleaps its channels, though in that case the effect is rather disagreeable than otherwise. Heat also is a thing that may be thus conducted, and so also is water, as everybody knows. Is grace, then, an element like an electric or galvanic force, that is stored up in the bodies of bishops and conveyed from the palms of their hands through sacramental channels to the souls of sinners, to work in them the remission of sins and the power of living righteous lives? The idea of "overflowing channels" certainly would seem to imply some such conception. At any rate, grace is something quite mechanical in its nature, and in its operation it follows mechanical laws quite as much as water does when it is led through earthen conduits to refresh and quicken vegetation in a

barren desert. The only peculiarity about it is that it can regularly be conveyed only by apostolically commissioned and authorized agents, but that it has a habit of constantly breaking away from the channels by which it is conveyed and accomplishing its results in places where they are not directly intended.

But how, now, does this conception agree with the Scriptural idea of grace? The Scriptural idea of grace, as we understand it, is the idea of divine favor, the idea of a kindly disposition and will of God towards men, especially towards the unworthy and sinners, and tending to do them good. In its fundamental conception the term is used in such passages as those in which it is said that persons *find grace or favor* in the eyes of God. Thus it is said, for instance, that Noah found *grace* in the eyes of the Lord (Gen. 6 : 8), Mary found *grace* with God (Luke 1 : 30), David found *grace* in the sight of God (Acts 7 : 46). This is the radical signification of the word, which may be traced in all its various applications in the Old and New Testament. In its primary sense, then, grace is the good will of God which is determined to bestow blessings that are not deserved; and then, secondarily, it is the result accomplished in its object by this good will, or the sum of the blessings bestowed. Thus St. Paul speaks of *grace* and of the *gift of grace* (Rom. 5 : 15), and the latter is "the grace wherein we stand" (Rom. 5 : 2). Agreeably to this conception the sinner is said to be justified *freely by God's grace* (Rom. 3 : 24); which means that he is forgiven and treated as a righteous person, not in consequence of any merit of his own, but solely because of God's good will. We are saved *by grace through faith* (Eph. 2 : 8)—by grace, not by works of law—through faith, not through channels manipulated by any historic episcopate. The effect of this divine grace, or saving will of God, is in a moral way to cause sinners to become such persons as they must be in whom God shall be able to be forever well pleased. The objective good will or pleasure of God works in men subjectively and produces in them pleasing moral personalities. The grace of God, then, is *moral power*; that is, where it is apprehended and appropriated by faith, it becomes a morally

transforming, quickening, sanctifying energy, serving to produce in men a God-like character or make them partakers of the divine nature.

The manner of this moral operation of divine grace we see illustrated in what is daily taking place among men. The favoring love of a good man has an ennobling effect upon its object. The good will going out in loving energy to another has power morally to elevate that other and make him better. But we see this power illustrated most fully in the life of Christ, in whom appeared the grace of God personally bringing salvation to all men. He is the grace of God incarnate, the *mercy-seat*, *ἱλαστήριον*, where through the revelation of the good will of God sinners are reconciled to God and transformed into well pleasing God-like personalities. We see Jesus exercising such transforming power in the days of His flesh. How often do we see sinners coming to Him, and having heard from His lips words of divine grace and forgiveness, go away new moral beings? With His words of forgiveness He ever joined the command to go and sin no more, and with His command came the power to obey. That was grace in its most genuine character. And it was a manifestation of moral power which has no likeness at all to any physical force that can be conducted from one point to another by any material channel. And such moral power Christ is still exercising among men. He is doing it now through the medium of the Holy Spirit, who takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto men, thus bringing His mind into touch with theirs and causing them to be quickened by His loving and gracious energy. Whatever view we may hold of the personality of the Holy Spirit, it remains a fact that through His agency men are brought into such immediate touch with the person of Christ as makes it possible for the truth and grace which are in Christ to apprehend them and transform them into his own image. Hence the Spirit is the only mediator of the grace of Christ, and has in theological literature sometimes been called grace itself—*gratia applicatrix*.

The Scriptural conception of grace, then, is the conception of

something personal and moral. It has nothing akin to the notion of a mere physical force or to the notion of a power controlled by a magic rite or ceremony. How can we think of God's good will towards men as being stored up in a reservoir, presided over by some special order of men, and conducted about by artificial channels which may be tapped and made to give up their contents by the touch of some magic wand? That, we believe, is the Pagan, and not the Christian, conception of the nature and operation of the divine power in the world. At any rate, we are sure that the New Testament warrants no such conception. What sort of a God would He be whose will could thus be supposed to have bottled itself up and to suffer itself to be manipulated now in such talismanic way? We might think of a mere blind physical force, or of an arbitrary and capricious God, like those of the heathen, as behaving in this manner; but we cannot thus think a God who is infinitely rational, and wise, and good. But do not our theologies all tell us of *means of grace*, and do not Protestants admit of this idea as well as Anglo-Catholics? Yes, but means of grace are something different from the Anglo-Catholic channels, through which grace is supposed to flow as water flows through a pipe. Means of grace are institutions or ordinances of the Church, administered by those who are appointed by the Church for this purpose, and designed to serve as aids to the genesis and development of that faith by whose exercise alone the gifts and benefits of grace can be appropriated and enjoyed. This we believe to be a conception that is both Scriptural and rational, and it has always been accepted by Protestant Christians. The Heidelberg Catechism teaches that we become partakers of Christ and all His benefits by faith only, and that the Holy Spirit works faith in our hearts by the preaching of the Gospel, and confirms it by the use of the sacraments. That, we believe, is a true and Scriptural conception, and by it we are willing to stand. And we are sure that it involves a far nobler philosophy of the Christian salvation than does the semi-paganism of the Archdeacon of Ohio.

## AMONG OUR EXCHANGES.

*The Lutheran Quarterly*, of Gettysburg, for January, contains an article of 46 pages, by Dr. M. Valentine on the subject of "Infant Faith," which seems to be of interest to the Lutheran Church just now because of a proposed new formula for infant baptism. The question is whether the confession of faith is to be supposed to be made by the child or by the parents. In regard to the possibility of infant faith Dr. Valentine comes to a negative conclusion, which it seems to us is the only possible conclusion, and ought to be regarded as final.

In the January number of *The American Journal of Theology* Dr. W. R. Harper, of the University of Chicago, pleads for a reconstruction of the curriculum of the modern theological seminary. The present curriculum, he claims, was shaped one hundred years ago, and is not adequate to the democratic conditions of our age and country. He thinks that the course of study should be extended to four years, and that after the first year the selection of studies should be optional to the student. We quote the following sentences, in which there is doubtless much reason, although many theological professors would probably not accept the view presented: "The seminary is not the place in which men are to learn certain views, or to receive and adopt certain opinions. It is rather a place in which men shall be taught to think."

Protestants who want to understand the spirit and aims of Roman Catholicism should read *The Catholic World*, of New York, a monthly publication designed for general circulation, which is always interesting. The March number contains an article by H. C. Corrane on the "Witness of Protestantism to Catholic Truth," in which Protestantism is declared to be, like Mohammedanism, merely a scourge to Christianity, which, however, is said to have nearly served its purpose and to be rapidly passing away. When reading this, one may wonder whether it is intended most to impose upon the Catholic or the Protestant reader. Protestants know that Protestantism is neither dead nor

dying, and it would doubtless be well for the Catholic if he knew it too.

*The Methodist Review*, published at Nashville, Tenn., in its last issue, has an interesting article by E. B. Chappell, D.D., on "Scientific Preaching." Dr. Chappell disapproves of the discussion of scientific questions in the pulpit, because it is generally unedifying and often injurious. When a preacher takes the position that certain scientific theories, like that of evolution, for example, are in conflict with Biblical truth, then it is the Bible that suffers most in the public mind. On this subject preachers should learn wisdom by past experience. Luther said of Copernicus: "This fool wishes to reverse the entire science of astronomy; but sacred scripture tells us that God commanded the sun to stand, not the earth." Would preachers like to stand by that now? Dr. Chappell closes his article with this sound advice: "Beware of making the authority of the Bible and the truth of Christianity depend on some opinion of yours about the nature of inspiration and the proper method of Biblical interpretation."

*The Princeton and Reformed Review* is ably conducted and dignified, and is devoted to the maintenance of Calvinistic orthodoxy. It yields nothing to the claims of modern Biblical critics and advanced theological thinkers. We find, however, in the January number of the current year, a sympathetic article on "Schleiermacher," by James Lindsay, of Kilmarnock, Scotland. The modern Scotch theologians, by the way, are for the most part quite *modern* thinkers. The writer of the article just referred to, while expressing dissent from a few of Schleiermacher's theological opinions, nevertheless regards him as by far the greatest and most influential theologian of the present century. He styles him "the regenerator of the theology of the most wonderful century the world has seen," "the path-breaking pioneer of Protestant theology of the nineteenth century," "to whom the religious life was no daughter of theology, but a deep and religious feeling." Schleiermacher made Christ central in theology, as He

is central in the Church ; and this is his great merit. "The Christianity he preached was one of personal union of life with Christ." And by his doctrine of "the Christian consciousness—the consciousness of a personal relation to Christ, he rendered quite an inestimable service to the life of the whole Christian Church." There is a "new theology," then, and Schleiermacher is its founder.

*The New World*, a quarterly review devoted to religion, ethics and theology is always fresh and interesting. The leading article in the March number is from the pen of Professor McGiffert, and treats of the Study of Early Church History. Professor McGiffert contends that "there is no period in Christian history which needs more fresh and thorough study than the earliest period, and none that will more richly repay such study." This is due to the unique importance of that period and to the great number of unsolved or wrongly solved problems relating to it. Modern discoveries have thrown much light upon that period and modern historical study is doing still more to bring out its true meaning. There is, in fact, a new science of Church history and the representations of writers of a quarter of a century ago are no longer regarded as satisfactory. Among the principles which characterize the new method of historical study, Professor McGiffert enumerates the following : "Freedom from dogmatic prejudice and from polemic interest ; rigorous use of the sources ; constant employment of the constructive faculty ; thoroughgoing application of the principle of evolution ; breadth of interest resulting in the multiplication of the historian's points of view." The discussion of these five principles is very interesting and instructive.

*The Homiletic Review*, for April, opens with an article on *Christ's View of the Divine Fatherhood*, by Charles M. Mead, D.D. Dr. Mead contends that, according to Christ's teaching, the divine fatherhood is something ethical, and can therefore not be universal, as is claimed by so many theologians at the present time. It has its limitation in the ethical condition of men. And yet Dr. Mead virtually concedes all that these theologians would care to contend for, namely, the impartial love of God to all men, and His desire for the salvation of all ; for the universality of the divine fatherhood is emphasized especially in opposition to that theory of the divine sovereignty, which makes God's relation to

man resemble the relation of a mechanic to his work, and supposes that without affection or feeling He has ordained some men to everlasting destruction. Dr. Mead sums up his view in the following sentence: "Jesus, though He nowhere explicitly calls God the Father of all men, yet frequently calls Him the Father of His disciples, and represents Him as perfectly realizing, in His relation to all men, the ideal of protecting care and impartial love which is imperfectly typified in a good human father." Among other interesting articles in this number of the *Homiletic Review* is one on "Commanding the Attention," by Dr. J. S. Kennard, which preachers generally should read.

A Protestant might suppose that the Roman Catholic church had reason to be perfectly satisfied with its position and rights here in the United States. This, however, according to the leading article by Rev. Thomas Hughes, S.J., in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, for January of the current year, seems not to be the case. This article explains that the Catholic Church divides the world into *canonical* countries and *missionary* countries. Spain is a canonical country. Cuba and Porto Rico have until lately been canonical countries. The United States and Canada are missionary countries. The difference between the two kinds of countries is said to resemble the difference between a *state* and a *territory* in the American union. A state enjoys an autonomy and privileges which a territory cannot enjoy. So in a canonical country the church, being in a position to make terms with the government, and exact their fulfillment, enjoys privileges which she cannot have in a missionary country like the United States, over whose government she can exercise no direct influence. Her constant aim and ambition must, therefore, be to achieve such a position in the country as would entitle the latter to be treated as a canonical country.

The question which a Protestant would like to ask is, supposing it were possible for the Roman Catholic Church to transform the United States into a canonical country by getting a controlling influence in the government, what would she make of it? Would she restore the Inquisition, and reduce the country to the condition of Spain or Cuba? Considering the jealousy with which "Americanism" is regarded at Rome, we may be sure that important consequences would follow if this Church could get political control of the country. We recommend the *Catholic Review* to Protestant clergymen who desire to get an inside view of the Catholic Church.

## NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

**GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.** By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York City. Pages xxii. and 688. Crown 8vo. Published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1899. Price, \$3.00.

The rich contents of this work, and the noble form in which the celebrated publishers present it to the public, make this, indeed, a *royal* volume among the very best works on sacred literature.

Dr. Briggs seeing the twenty-fifth anniversary of his professorship in Union Theological Seminary approaching (which was quite recently celebrated in a manner eminently befitting the man and the occasion), in order that he might mark that important event with proper significance as an author, prepared and sends forth this volume, dedicated to the alumni and students of Union Theological Seminary. It is, therefore, the latest publication of this well-known author, and it will doubtless be read with unusual interest.

In one sense it is an expansion of his former work, published in 1883, entitled: "*Biblical Study*" (which has passed through nine editions since that time), if we consider the general spirit and purpose of the work; but it is, in fact, a new work, not only because the volume is twice the size of the former, but also because the general originality makes it such.

Of special significance is the new title. It is not "*Biblical Study*," but "*The Study of Holy Scripture*." For the author the Scripture is "Holy" and for inherent reasons differentiated, not only from the general literature of the world, but also from the so-called "sacred books," even though he finds a connection in the essential truth found in all; and as "*Scripture*," and not *Scriptures*, there is an internal harmony and unity which no other collection of writings can possibly have, and all this, too, in the face of the fact that the work of higher criticism is so radically modifying the former views concerning the general character of the Bible as the record of revelation. It is significant, in view of the painful experience through which the author had to pass as an independent writer on higher criticism, and significant, too, as a guiding principle for the proper appreciation of all which this important work contains.

For the honest reader, then, all prejudice against the author and this work is disarmed. For Dr. Briggs the Bible is *Holy Scripture*, and his purpose in this work as the result of many years' faithful study as teacher of Biblical Theology is to prepare not only ministers, but also intelligent laymen, to study the Bible comprehensively and correctly as to its parts and as a whole, with the full assurance that whatever modifications of views

scientific criticism may render necessary and, however, more rational our faith in the Sacred Scripture will become, it will be none the less true, living and saving by delivering it from the unhistoric, unscientific, even superstitious, theories of the traditions of the past. Yes, it still remains "*a means of grace*" (Chap. XXVI.) in the truest sense.

Three facts cannot help but win the confidence of the candid reader: (1) The reverend spirit of the author, even when he does apparently the most destructive work (better said, *reconstructive* work) demanded by the clearest, scientific data. He delights to find the *truth*, even while exposing errors. (2) The evidences on every page of the very ripest scholarship, and (3) His calm consciousness of the truth he is seeking and finding, however much it may differ from the views of some others. One naturally looks for more of the polemic and defensive. If Dr. Briggs laid himself open to adverse criticism, and even trial for heresy, for want of fullness of statement and unwise forms of expressions, as, *e. g.*, in his celebrated Inaugural Address, surely neither charges can reasonably be brought against him in this work. The volume will prove to be its own best defense, if that is needed. Dr. Briggs "on trial" remains almost entirely in the background or objective. In a word, this work is the latest confident and unselfish utterance of the ripest, scientific, biblical scholarship concerning the Bible.

As to the leading features of this magnificent work but little, and that fragmentarily, can be stated in this limited review.

Of all studies that of Holy Scriptures still remains the most important, extensive, profound and attractive. It is to be regretted that a false reverence for the Bible and a narrow, sectarian partisanship still proves a hindrance to its proper study. The author sees a providence in the languages prepared for the Bible, but they are human languages still, and as such subject to the recognized laws of literary criticism. He sees nothing in the decisions of the Church, or even in true Catholic traditions, to hinder any just criticism. It is demanded and sought for by a free, truth-loving spirit.

The history of the formation of both the Old Testament and New Testament Canons are given in chapters that show a marvelous display of research. So also the history both of the Hebrew and Greek texts and that of the various translations.

The chapters on Higher Criticism, of course, command special attention. Those on the *history* of higher criticism disclose the fact, to a surprising degree, that the critical spirit was active in many long before our day, and that the critical theories of to-day are really the resultants of forces at work in the Church, especially since the Reformation in the Catholic as well as in the Protestant Church. The chapters on the Practice and general results of criticism soon show how utterly untenable are the common, traditional theories concerning the authorship, dates, etc., of books and parts of books both of the Old Testament and

the New Testament, and that there are errors of various sorts in the Bible, to the consternation of those whose theories concerning the origin of the Bible, are not any more consistent with the being of God and man than the origin of the "Magdeburg Letter," which some of our credulous forefathers in Germany once believed fell directly from Heaven to bring great benefits to the possessor! Nor will a rational faith suffer the least shock, not only because all the errors pointed out do not in the least affect the *essentials* of the Bible, but because the very inaccuracies furnish a strong proof that the record of the Bible was made in harmony with the laws controlling all human history, and that it is not of a certain mechanical, and therefore incredible, supernatural origin.

This, then, raises the important question of inspiration, and with it that of infallibility, credibility, etc., and their relation to the results of criticism. It is evident that here all depends upon the definition of inspiration. Is it that found in the Bible? A careful and painstaking study of it shows a statement very simple and far less exacting than that of the theologians. Is it that of the symbolical books of the Church which express the faith of the Church in Scripture? Nothing very exact and definite is found in them to fetter the spirit of investigation. There remain yet the definitions of dogmatic systems of schools of theology which generally are the views of individual teachers which also are indefinite and of no binding authority. It is a significant fact that as one leaves the simple, unformulated statements of the sacred writings to pass to the strained, abstract and complex statements of the symbols, and to the theoretical and scholastic statements of the theologians, they become less authoritative and satisfactory, and time shows that they will become more so, for the simple reason that all such statements are the results of limited, fallible, human minds, according to human logic, and swayed by the spirit of a given age, endeavoring to construct from sacred material a rule which, from the demands of the case, would have to be infallible itself, which is asserting an impossibility and a contradiction. There is no gain in all such attempts, but loss—no help, but a hindrance rather. What remains? The concrete, living and eternal substance of the Truth itself as contained in the Bible as its own authentication upon heart and mind as from the Holy Ghost, and that for the demands of any age and all ages, no matter what changes our views may have to undergo as to the outer form and unessential parts of Scripture, which it is the very mission of criticism to regulate in order that truth may be freed from error. Well does Dr. Briggs say that "the divine teaching as to religion, faith and morals in the substance of Holy Scripture is errorless and infallible," and it is his sincere hope that "I shall lead not a few by these chapters, as I have by the grace of God through my other writings, back to Holy Scripture and Holy Church, with a firmer faith and holy joy and love in their exhibition of the grace and glory of our God and Saviour."

Of the portions of this work treating on the characteristics of the prose and poetry of the Bible it is not necessary to speak beyond the one fact that the latest study reveals far more poetic forms in the New Testament than is generally supposed. Dr. Briggs acknowledges the "patient, laborious and scholarly help" of his highly accomplished daughter, Emilie Grace Briggs, B.D., without whose help, he says, he could not have finished this work.

The writer cannot help expressing an oppressive sense of humiliation at the fact that in this age of the Church an author of such learning, sincerity, positive Christian faith and piety should ever have been branded with dishonor! May the Spirit of all Truth deliver our beloved Church from such folly and sin. "And ye shall know the Truth and the Truth shall make you free." John 8:32.

J. G. D.

**LIFE AND TIMES OF WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE.** By John Clark Ridpath. Published by The Jones Publishing Company, Cincinnati. Sold by subscription only. 639 pages.

This we found a most interesting and instructive work. The subject is a rich and fruitful one; the author is well known for his qualifications for such an undertaking, and the publishers did all that can be asked in the way of printing and binding. The style of the author is clear, dignified, animated and forceful. The writer presents William E. Gladstone to the reader, from his boyhood, through the schools, into public life down through the various vicissitudes of his career to his death on the 19th of May, 1898, in his 89th year. But we get not only a view of the great Commoner, in this work, as his life was developed from stage to stage, but also a vivid picture of the times covered by his public life, which began in 1832, when at the age of 23 years he was elected a member of the British Parliament, and ended only when death summoned him from the arena.

Mr. Gladstone was a politician and a statesman. And, first of all, he was an honest man. He was honest in his convictions. And he always had convictions. When any subject confronted him he studied it thoroughly and came to intelligent conclusions with regard to it. It is quite interesting to note how his views changed from time to time and became enlarged; how his opinions grew and gradually became established. While he surprised his friends and enemies sometimes by the enunciation of new views, yet it can easily be seen from his previous utterances that his convictions came upon him gradually. They were not rashly formed. He entered Parliament as a Tory, rooted and grounded in the tenets of conservatism. And for a number of years he stood firmly in the views of those whom he represented. But step by step he began to take positions in regard to bills submitted to Parliament showing marked liberal tendencies in his mind and heart. The time came when Oxford, the hot-bed of conservatism, would no longer return him as their representative. But he was at once taken up by a district of more liberal spirit.

And W. E. Gladstone, who started out as a Tory, became the leader of the Liberal party. And all the Reform measures adopted in England during the last fifty years were espoused and defended, and many of them originated and introduced, by Mr. Gladstone. His views did not always prevail. The Liberal party was not always in the ascendancy. Four times in his career Mr. Gladstone became Prime Minister, the first time in 1868 and the last time in 1892. Notable measures were passed during his incumbency, and yet each time his Ministry fell through want of confidence on the part of Parliament or the country, though the last time he resigned because Home Rule for Ireland which had triumphantly passed in the House of Commons failed in the House of Lords. With a warning to the Lords that the days of their interference with progress in government might perhaps be numbered, Mr. Gladstone retired from active interest in public affairs.

In the course of Gladstone we have an example of a man breaking the bonds of environment by the power of his own personality. He was brought up a Tory in his father's family; he was educated a Tory at Eton and Oxford, and when he stood for Parliament his patrons and supporters were Tories. But in course of time he ceased to be a Tory and became a Liberal; and he changed his positions not from policy, but from conviction. By his own personal power he rose above the restraints of his early days.

The strength of W. E. Gladstone came from several elements in his character. He was, in the first place, blessed by Providence with mental powers of a high degree. Then his abiding faith in God and Christianity was a ballast to his soul from first to last. We believe this to have been the foundation element in his character. Then came his honesty of purpose and faithfulness to his convictions. His generous sympathy for mankind, and especially for the oppressed children of men, gave him an influence he otherwise would not have possessed. Coupled with all these were his habits of industry and perseverance.

We desire to call attention yet to the nature of his preparatory education at Eton. This school has always been strict in its discipline. Mr. Gladstone attended it six years, from his twelfth to his eighteenth. The leading studies were Latin and Greek. Very little attention was paid to anything else. The curriculum was very narrow. Year after year the boys were drilled in the languages. Our preparatory schools are very different in this respect from Eton in those days, and Eton has changed too. Our schools for boys undertake to teach almost everything in two or three years. The result is they get a smattering of many things and thoroughness in nothing. We are Tory enough on this subject to believe that a few branches thoroughly mastered will constitute a better foundation for an education and substantial character than many studies pursued only to a very limited extent.

We can heartily recommend "The Life and Times of William

E. Gladstone," by Ridpath, as a book that can be read and studied with much profit.

A. E. T.

THE CHRISTIAN ECCLESIA. A Course of Lectures on the Early History and Early Conceptions of the Ecclesia, and Four Sermons. By Fenton John Anthony Hort, D.D., Lady Margaret Reader in Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Pages 306. Macmillan & Co., London, and the Macmillan Company, New York. 1897.

Dr. Hort, who, since the lectures contained in this volume were delivered, has been called from the Church militant into the Church triumphant, is known to the world as the collaborer of Dr. Westcott in the preparation of the best Greek text of the New Testament now extant. Any work written by so able and distinguished a scholar, especially in the line of New Testament study, may be expected to possess no small degree of merit. The author's known ability, learning and conscientious honesty are a guarantee that what he writes may be accepted as correct according to the best modern standard of scholarship. He indulges in no guess work, nor does he allow any ecclesiastical or dogmatic prepossessions to influence his theological conclusions.

The title of the book before us was chosen, we are told, in preference to the more familiar term *Church*, because it is free from the associations of institutions and doctrines which in the course of history have come to be connected with the latter term. What the author proposes to do is to set forth the idea of the Christian Ecclesia as it prevails in the New Testament, without any bias derived from later theological development. To this end he begins by an investigation of the term *ecclesia* in the Septuagint as well as in Classical Greek, and then follows it step by step through the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Apostolic Epistles. It must ever be regarded as a striking phenomenon that the word which plays so large a part in the history of Christian doctrine should occur but twice in the Gospels, namely, Matt. 16:18 and 18:17. The doubts of the genuineness of the passages in which it occurs, however, though not unnatural, the author thinks, are in reality unfounded. And besides, there is much in the Gospels bearing upon the idea of the ecclesia, where the word is not used. While speaking upon this subject, however, the author guards against the idea of confounding the Church with the kingdom of God, which has been so common since the time of Augustine. The Church may be regarded as the visible representative of the kingdom, or as the organ of its sway in the world, but it must not be identified with the kingdom itself.

The points of chief interest in the volume before us, however, are connected with what the author says in regard to the progressive development of the ecclesia in the Apostolic age, and in regard to the relation of the particular or local ecclesia to the general or universal Ecclesia. According to Dr. Hort it is a mistake to suppose that the Ecclesia sprang into being fully organized and

armed on the day of Pentecost. On the contrary, its formation was very slow. The author calls attention to the fact (p. 49) that up to the time of Ananias and Sapphira the word *ecclesia* does not occur in the Acts of the Apostles, Christians being designated as "they that believed," "the brethren," "the disciples," etc. This doubtless implies that the Christian community separated itself but slowly from the Jewish community, and that it was but gradually that it assumed an organized form. There were at first no officers at all. "The Apostles were not in any proper sense officers of the ecclesia," says Dr. Hort. "The first officers who are definitely mentioned are the Seven," p. 231.

And during the early formative period there was no outward center of unity or authority—no mother church extending its authority over daughter churches and binding them all together in one common bond of union. The only bond of union then existing among Christians was Christ Himself. The local ecclesiae were independent, and each was supposed to possess the attributes of the whole. "Each partial society," says Dr. Hort, "is set forth as having a unity of its own, and being itself a body made up of many members has, therefore, a corporate life of its own; and yet these attributes could not be ascribed to it as an *absolutely* independent and as it were insular society; they belong to it only as a representative member of the great whole," p. 103. Again, p. 168, we have the following language on the same subject: "To each local Ecclesia St. Paul has ascribed a corresponding unity of its own; each is a body of Christ and a sanctuary of God; but there is no grouping of them into partial wholes or into one great whole. The members which make up the One Ecclesia are not communities but individual men. The One Ecclesia includes all members of all partial Ecclesiae; but its relations to them all are direct, not mediate."

On the long-debated question as to the relation of "presbyter" and "bishop" Dr. Hort agrees substantially with the view, supported by the authority of Lightfoot, that they are convertible, and denote but one office. The former is the official title, the latter is descriptive of the functions and duties of the office. St. Paul's exhortation to the Ephesian elders Dr. Hort would translate as follows: "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock in which the Holy Ghost has set you to have oversight." The view recently advocated by Harnack, Allen and McGiffert, that the terms *presbyter* and *bishop* from the first denoted different functions, and that the functions of the bishop were of one kind with those of the deacon, is distinctly rejected by Dr. Hort, p. 194. There were but two offices in the Apostolic Church, and these were instituted, not by any Divine command or ordinance, but by the agency of the Church herself according to an existing need. We have already seen that Dr. Hort does not regard the Apostles as having filled an *office*. They were personal witnesses of the Lord and of His resurrection, and were at first the Church itself, not an order or office in the Church. Offices came to exist only when

the duties which belonged to all were transferred to chosen individuals; and the only instance we have of this in the New Testament is in the case of the diaconate and the presbyterate. "Of officers higher than Elders," writes Dr. Hort, "we find nothing that points to an institution or system, nothing like the episcopal system of later times. In the New Testament the word *επίσκοπος* as applied to men, mainly, if not always, is *not* a title, but a description of the Elder's function," p. 132.

Will this then settle the dispute between Presbyterianism and Episcopacy? No, for the Apostolic Church, according to Dr. Hort, is not a model to be imitated by the Church in all after ages. For as a developing organism the Church must in the nature of the case produce organs corresponding to the needs of particular times, and the question of what they shall be, is only a question of expediency and adaptation. "The true way, the Apostolic way, of regarding offices and officers in the Ecclesia, is to regard them as organs of its corporate life," p. 230. But this view of the organization of the Church ought to settle the appeal to the New Testament for the decision of questions in dispute between the advocates of different systems of Church polity. Such an appeal mistakes the true nature of the Christian Scriptures. On this point we quote entire the last paragraph of the book before us. Speaking of the futility of the effort to derive any law from the presidency of James in Jerusalem, or from the mission of Timothy our author continues: "In this as in so many other things is seen the futility of endeavoring to make the Apostolic history into a set of authoritative precepts, to be rigorously copied without regard to time and place, thus turning the Gospel into a second Levitical Code. The Apostolic age is full of embodiments of purposes and principles of the most instructive kind; but the responsibility of choosing the means was left forever to the Ecclesia itself, and to each Ecclesia, guided by ancient precedent on the one hand, and adaptation to present and future needs on the other. The lesson of the book of the Ecclesia, and of every Ecclesia, is not a law but a history." To all who are concerned to learn that lesson well, we commend this volume of the now sainted Dr. Hort; which, we should have said before, is edited and published by J. A. F. Murray, of Emanuel College, Cambridge, although we are assured that it contains nothing but the thought of the author himself.

**THE PRINCIPLES OF PROTESTANTISM.** An Examination of the Doctrinal Differences between the Protestant Churches and the Church of Rome, by Rev. I. P. Lilley, M.A., Arbroath. Pages 250. Price 75 cents. T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. 1898.

This volume belongs to the series of "Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students," edited by Prof. Marcus Dodds, D.D., and Rev. Alexander Whyte, D.D. It is designed accordingly for a large circle of readers. And this fact has probably influenced somewhat not only the language and style of the work, but also the mechanical make-up of the volume. It is printed on

clean paper, and nicely bound in cloth; but the type is too small (bourgeois) and the page too crowded to make pleasant reading; although this doubtless serves to bring down the price to the level of the ability of a large number of purchasers. The style would be more forcible if it were less wordy and diffuse.

The work might properly have been called a treatise on the science of symbolics, as it discusses, in three parts, the confessional differences of the two grand divisions of Christendom. After the introduction, which gives an historical account of the origin of Protestantism, we have, in the *first part*, a discussion of the "Differences concerning the Evangelical Application of the Truth—the Material Principle." The order pursued in this part follows pretty closely that adopted by Möhler in his celebrated work on symbolics. It begins with the consideration of the state of man as created; then passes to the subject of the fall, to original sin, the moral inability of the unregenerate, regeneration, justification, good works, the state after death, giving the divergent views of the different churches on these points. The *second part* discusses the "Differences concerning the Source of Truth—the Formal Principle." In this part are explained the views of the different churches on the nature, the authority the perspicuity and the perfection of the Sacred Scriptures. The *third part* treats of the "Differences concerning the Ecclesiastical Embodiment of the Truth—the Social Principle." This part is devoted to the consideration of the opposing views concerning the church, the ministry, divine worship, the sacraments, ecclesiastical polity, papal infallibility, and the Church in relation to the unseen world.

In presenting the differences between the different confessions the author evidently regards himself as being more than a simple reporter or historian. He acts the part of an advocate, whose business is not merely to show how the doctrines of Protestantism differ from those of Romanism, but at all points to defend the validity of the former against the latter. In a work designed for the use of Bible classes in the Protestant Church there can, of course, be no objection to this method, provided only the opposing views of the different churches be given fairly and accurately; which we believe to be the case in this work of Mr. Lilley's, and which is not the case in the work of the Roman Catholic Möhler. As to the manner in which the Protestant views are vindicated against the Catholic the scientific theologian may not be altogether satisfied. Mr. Lilley's method of argumentation is the old Protestant method of using Scripture. His quotations are quite profuse, but in our opinion at least they do not always prove what they are intended to prove. His assumption seems to be still that the Bible is a treasury of proof texts, which establish any proposition or sentence that is of like sound with themselves—an assumption that is no longer tenable in the light of modern Biblical theology.

There is doubtless still need for works of the kind here under

notice—works setting forth the original and confessional differences of the existing Churches. But has not the time come, too, for works of a somewhat different class, works of a more critical character, which shall point out the one-sidedness and defects of the opposing confessions. In their present form they can not all be true; and the most rational assumption is that the truth is not all on one side. Protestantism, at least, which rejects the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church, can have no hesitation in admitting that all ecclesiastical confessions are one-sided and defective, and that the truth will ultimately be found in a higher principle which shall exclude the defects of each. Take in the way of illustration the opposing doctrines concerning the original state of man. The teaching of the Roman Church is that God made man at first a purely natural being, and then superadded "the admirable gift of righteousness," which accordingly is not a part of man's original nature, and consequently that nature suffered no essential deterioration when man sinned. We have no hesitation in pronouncing that doctrine erroneous, for the reason that *righteousness* is not a thing that can be communicated to any being from without. But is then, the Protestant doctrine more satisfactory, that original righteousness was a con-created quality in the first man? In answer to this question it boots little to quote from Genesis that "God saw all His work which He had made, and it was very good." The question is, can we think of a moral quality being communicated to any being in the moment of creation? Is not this as untenable a view as is the Roman Catholic? May we not suppose that Romanist and Protestant will some day come to see face to face on this subject, when both will recognize that righteousness can be no *gift* at all, but can only be self-acquired by moral action? And would not a work having for its end the critical solution of differences now be a valuable work? In such a work, however, we are sure that the Catholic would fare far worse than the Protestant; for if there is any one-sidedness on the Protestant side, it is usually the consequence of some opposite perversion of truth on the Roman Catholic side.

**NEGLECTED FACTORS IN THE STUDY OF THE EARLY PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY.** By the Rev. James Orr, D.D., Professor of Church History in the United Presbyterian Theological College, Edinburgh. Pages, 235. A.C. Armstrong and Son, 51 East Tenth Street, New York, 1899.

This volume consists of three lectures originally prepared for the Mansfield Summer School at Oxford in 1894, and delivered as the Morgan Lecture Course in the Theological Seminary of Auburn, New York, in 1897. It is printed and bound in the Armstrong's best style, and is a delight to the reader of books. The subject-matter of the volume is an historical study in the early development of Christianity. The "neglected factors" discussed are three, and relate to the extension and influence of early Christianity in the heathen world. His proposition is that this

extension and this influence were of much wider reach than has generally been supposed by Christian historians.

In the *first lecture* the author endeavors, and with apparent success, to establish this proposition with reference to the "lateral" or numerical extension of Christianity in the Roman Empire previous to the time of Constantine. Gibbon, and after him many others, estimated that the Christians constituted at most but one-twentieth part of the population of the Roman Empire at that time. Dr. Orr maintains that the proportion was much larger, and did probably not fall far short of one-fifth; so that, if the whole population of the Empire, according to Gibbon's estimate, was 120,000,000, the Christian portion of it must have aggregated 24,000,000. For this view Dr. Orr relies upon the evidence afforded by the extent and size of the catacombs, and upon the testimony of various Pagan as well as Christian writers of the period. The aim of the *second lecture* is to prove that Christianity had a much larger extension "vertically," that is, as respects the different strata of society, than is commonly believed. Even the statements of the New Testament, the author thinks, prove that St. Paul's assertion that "not many wise and not many noble were called," must be taken with some allowance. Gibbon's assertion, following Celsus, that the Christians constituted only the very "dregs of the population," is wholly erroneous. Christianity counted among its adherents from the first many men and women of noble birth, generous culture, and ample fortune. The literary activity of Christianity during the second century, our author thinks, is itself an evidence of a considerable degree of culture among the Christians. There were among them, of course, many poor people and many slaves; but the bulk of the Christian community did not consist of the "lowest dregs of society," but of the more respectable and comfortable middle classes.

In the *third lecture* the author proposes to prove that Christianity "had a much greater influence *intensively* or *penetratively*, that is, in its effects on the thought and life of the age, than is generally acknowledged." This, in our opinion, is the most interesting part of the volume before us. The opinion has come to be pretty widely accepted that the old Catholic Church, that is, the Church as it was constituted in the time before Constantine, was the result in large measure of Greek and Roman influences. If its religion came from the world of Jewish life, its dogmatism and institutionalism came largely from Greek and Roman sources respectively. This was Ritschl's view, and also that of the late Dr. Hatch; it is also the view advocated by Harnack. And that it is not without weight would seem to appear from a comparison of the religious simplicity of the New Testament with the dogmatism and ritualism of the old Catholic Church, at the time when it comes fully into the light of history.

But now, Dr. Orr argues, such an influence exerted by the Græco-Roman spirit upon Christianity, implies a reciprocal in-

fluence exerted by Christianity upon the intellectual and moral life of the Greek and Roman world. "Before Christianity could suck the marrow out of Greek philosophy, as Harnack supposes it did," he says, "it must have penetrated into minds possessed with the spirit and ideas of that philosophy—must have entered deeply into the circles and schools of culture." Men like Athenagoras, Aristides, Justin Martyr, were not made philosophers by becoming Christians; on the contrary, Christianity came to them as philosophers, and as philosophers they accepted it, and were moulded by its spirit. And so it came to countless numbers of others, many of whom, though they did not accept it, were yet moulded by it. In this way Dr. Orr accounts for the religious and moral revival which took place in Graeco-Roman heathenism during the second century. The fact of such revival is beyond question, and seems to be something like the counter reformation which took place in the Catholic Church after the rise of Protestantism. This influence of Christianity extended to the worship of heathenism as well as to its doctrines and moral precepts. For instance, the so-called *mysteries* of the Pagan cults, which have recently come to be believed to have exerted an influence upon the ceremonialism of the Christian Sacraments, may with equal probability be believed to have suffered an influence from the Christian institutions.

There is one obvious objection to the theory that the doctrines and precepts of Christianity were widely known to the cultured and literary classes during the second and third centuries, and indeed affected their thinking to no small degree, and that is the fact that Christianity is so seldom mentioned in the Greek and Roman literature of that period. This silence of heathen writers Dr. Orr supposes to have been the consequence of a common *conspiracy*. "Nothing is better ascertained," he says, "than that it was the fashion of heathen writers, even of those who were best acquainted with Christianity, to show their contempt for it, by deliberately dissembling their knowledge of it, and refraining from any mention of it in their works." There are some circumstances which seem to make this theory plausible; as, for instance, this, that Marcus Aurelius, who must have known Christianity well, passes it by with only one contemptuous reference. And yet we confess that for us it is not easy to accept this theory of a "conspiracy of silence." How was it possible to unite virtually all the writers of the civilized world for two centuries or more in such a conspiracy? If such a conspiracy existed, it must have been rather unconscious than deliberate. Perhaps we have here another "neglected factor," which future investigation may bring into clearer light. This little volume of Dr. Orr shows that the study of Church history is not closed. There remains still much to be learned and much to be explained. And to all who are interested in that study we cordially commend this volume.

HOMILETICS: Lectures on Preaching. By Theodore Christlieb, D.D. Formerly Professor of Theology and University Preacher at Bonn. Edited by Th. Haarback. Translated by Rev. C. H. Irwin, M.A. Pages xii + 390. T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. 1897. Price, \$3.00.

A new work on Homiletics in our day seems to be a work of supererogation. Of such "helps to the pulpit" the market is full. The work before us, however, in its English dress, possesses a sufficiently peculiar character to justify its addition to the general stock, even at the high price at which it is supplied to the American student. The work proceeds from a German professor who was thoroughly qualified for the production of something in this line that may be profitable to the modern preacher. Prof. Christlieb, who, by the way, has been known to the American public for many years by his excellent volume on "Modern Doubt and Christian Belief," as well as by various other productions on practical religious subjects, was no mere theoretical homilete. He was himself for many years a successful preacher and pastor, first in London, and afterwards at Friedrichshafen, in Germany. He was a man of practical wisdom and experience as well as of varied and profound learning. He was, moreover, a man of deep piety and of earnest Christian and Biblical faith. While he was not blind to the results of modern Biblical and scientific studies, his Christian faith was not in the least disturbed by any critical, exegetical or historical conclusions. A treatise on the science and art of preaching by a man of such qualifications could not be otherwise than interesting and valuable to the preacher.

But there is another circumstance that enhances the value of these "Lectures on Preaching," and will probably commend them to many of the readers of this REVIEW, and that is the fact that the author is a German, who views the subject of preaching from a more Christological and churchly standpoint than is usually the case in English treatises on homiletics. Excellent as these treatises generally are from a merely rhetorical and formal point of view, yet there is much that a Reformed preacher especially misses in them, and for which he is bound to turn in some other direction. The style of preaching which they set forth is not exactly the style which commends itself to the Reformed preacher; and in his pulpit practice he meets with questions and difficulties in regard to which they leave him in the dark. There is, for instance, the question as to the relation of the sermon to the liturgy, to the Church year and the pericopes, to the conditions of the congregation, and to the administration of the Sacraments. On this and similar questions the ordinary English works on homiletics have nothing to say. In fact these questions do not exist for them. And the preachers for whom they do exist will, therefore, gladly turn to such a work as this of Prof. Christlieb, in which they receive attention. It should be added, however, in this connection that, while Prof. Christlieb was a German, and a student of Schleiermacher, he is free from that intellectual

provincialism which is usually supposed to characterize the German theologian. He is not a blind worshipper of everything that is German. For instance, he does not follow Schleiermacher on all points, although the fact is plain that he has been profoundly influenced by the work of that great man in the department of practical theology. In contradistinction to Schleiermacher, who considered preaching merely as an *aesthetic* or *representational* activity, Prof. Christlieb regards it as essentially a *witnessing* or *martyretic* activity, having an evangelistic as well as devotional aim. And besides this, there are other departures from the positions of the modern master in practical theology, showing the independence of the work.

The work consists of four chapters, preceded by an introduction, or *prolegomena*, in which are discussed the meaning and scope of homiletics, the relation of homiletics to rhetoric, the history of homiletics, and its place in practical theology. The *first chapter* treats of *essential*, the second of *personal*, the third of *material*, and the fourth of *formal* homiletics. The first chapter discusses the meaning and nature, the scope and aim of preaching, and answers to the question, *What is preaching?* The essence of preaching is defined thus: "Preaching means publicly to testify in the name of God the divine will and purpose, and more particularly the salvation that is in Christ, with the view of glorifying the divine name, the advancement of God's kingdom, and therewith the salvation of men," p. 73. This chapter also contains a discussion of the relation of the sermon to the liturgy, in which, contrary to the custom of many German homiletics, the former is coördinated with the latter, and its importance emphasized in opposition to the practice of the Roman Catholic Church. Protestantism must always lay much stress upon the office of preaching in the exercise of its cultus.

The subject of the *second chapter* is "Personal requisites for public preaching." Here we have a discussion of the personal knowledge, experience, faith, unction, gifts and character required in the real preacher. This answers the question, *Who is to preach?* The author adopts the principle, "*Pectus disertos facit.*" The question, *What is to be preached*, receives its answer in the *third chapter*, the general subject of which is, "Material and Contents of the Sermon." Prof. Christlieb holds that the source of homiletic material is the Bible, although all parts of the Bible are not equal in this regard. The New Testament is richer in homiletic material than the Old; and in the New Testament, again, the Gospels form, above all other portions of Scripture, even above the Epistles, the fundamental material for preaching. Christ is the objective content or truth of the sermon, and Scripture is a source of sermonic material in proportion to its relation to Christ. Can the *Apocrypha* also be used as a source of sermonic material? Not by the Protestant preacher, is Prof. Christlieb's answer, although he does not deny that many portions of them breathe a genuine biblical spirit. He thinks also

that the *Apocalypse* is rather barren soil for the purposes of the preacher. After a lengthy and interesting discussion of the homiletic selection, exposition and application of the text of Scripture in the sermon, the author comes to the question, what determines the choice of homiletic material in the regular service of the pulpit? In this connection he discusses the *lectionary question*, that is, the question concerning the use of the *pericopes* for homiletic purposes; and while he is opposed to the enforced use of the pericopal system, which gendereth to bondage, he favors the observance of the Church year, whose constitution he discusses at some length; and himself gives a large number of texts and themes appropriate to various parts of the Church year. This will probably by many be regarded as a most valuable portion of the volume. Besides the course of the Church year, the selection of homiletic material will be determined by special occasions, by the condition of the congregation, and by the spiritual states of the preacher. The *fourth chapter*, finally, treats of formal homiletics, or of the structure and delivery of sermons. This answers the question, *How shall we preach?* Here we have a discussion of the relative merits and demerits of analytical and synthetic, or textual and thematic sermons, and directions for the construction of either kind. In the manner of delivery the author advises freedom, although he recommends the constant writing of sermons. The preacher, he thinks, should accustom himself to the free reproduction of a written sermon after two or three careful perusals of it.

The above will give the reader some idea of this work on homiletics, which is in many respects so different from the works to which we have been accustomed, from Vinet to Phelps and Hoppin. The work of translation is fairly well done, although there are some defective renderings. For instance, the word *representative* is not the equivalent for *darstellend*, which is so frequently used in German homiletic literature from Schleiermacher down, as denoting that side of a sermon which has for its object the manifestation or exhibition of the Christian life already in the Church, in distinction from the other side, whose object is the production of such life. The word *representational* would come nearer to the signification of the original, although it is not quite adequate either. But while there are some infelicities in the translation of the work before us, one can have no serious difficulty in understanding it; and the diligent study of it cannot fail to exercise a salutary influence upon the preacher's habits. And in our day, when there is so much inquiry concerning the kind of preaching needed by the age, such a volume should be particularly welcome.